

July 26, 1973

H 6747

Carter
Casey, Tex.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chappell
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Collier
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Conlan
Conte
Coughlin
Crane
Cronin
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert
W., Jr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Duncan
du Pont
Edwards, Ala.
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Forsythe
Fountain
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Gaydos
Gilman
Ginn
Goldwater
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gubser
Guyer
Haley
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanrahan
Harsha
Harvey
Hastings
Hays
Hebert
Heckler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helms
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinshaw

Hogan
Holt
Hosmer
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Karth
Kazen
Keating
Kemp
Ketchum
Kuykendall
Latta
Lent
Littton
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lujan
McClory
McCloskey
McCollister
McDade
McEwen
McKay
McSpadden
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Mann
Maraziti
Martin, N.C.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathis, Ga.
Mayne
Mazzoli
Melcher
Michel
Miller
Mitchell, N.Y.
Mizell
Molohan
Montgomery
Moorhead,
Calif.
Natcher
Nichols
O'Brien
Owens
Parris
Perkins
Peyser
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Preyer
Price, Tex.
Quile
Quillen
Randall
Rarick
Rhodes

Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rose
Roush
Rousset
Roy
Runnels
Ruppe
Ruth
Sandman
Sarasin
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Schneebell
Sebelius
Shipley
Shoup
Shuster
Sikes
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Spence
Stanton
James V.
Steed
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Towell, Nev.
Treen
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Veysey
Vigorito
Waggoner
Walsh
Wampler
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.,
Calif.
Wyatt
Wyder
Wylie
Wyman
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Ill.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zion
Zwach

NOES—139

Abzug
Adams
Addabbo
Anderson,
Calif.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspin
Badillo
Barrett
Bergland
Biester
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Breux
Breckinridge
Brown, Calif.
Buchanan
Burke, Calif.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.
Chisholm
Clay
Cohen
Collins, Ill.
Corman
Cotter
Culver

Daniels,
Dominick V.
Danielson
Dellenback
Dellums
Diggs
Dingell
Drinan
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gialmo
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gude
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington

Helstoski
Hollifield
Holtzman
Howard
Johnson, Calif.
Jordan
Kastenmeier
Koch
Kyros
Lehman
McCormack
McFall
McKinney
Mallard
Mallory
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Meeds
Mezvinisky
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Moakley
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix

O'Byrne
O'Hara
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Pickle
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Rallsback
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino

Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ryan
St Germain
Sarbanes
Seiberling
Sisk
Smith, N.Y.
Staggers
Stanton
J. William
Steele
Stokes
Stratton
Studds

Symington
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Ware
Whalen
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Wolff
Wright
Yates
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—62

Abdnor
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Arendts
Bell
Bowen
Brasco
Brotzman
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Clancy
Conyers
Devine
Dickinson
Erlenborn
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Frenzel

Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Griffiths
Grover
Gunter
Hanna
Hawkins
Horton
King
Kluczynski
Landgrebe
Landrum
Leggett
Lott
Madigan
Metcalf
Milford
Mills, Ark.
Minshall, Ohio
Myers

Patman
Pettis
Podell
Regula
Riegle
Roe
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roybal
Schroeder
Shriver
Skubitz
Stark
Stephens
Symms
Thompson, N.J.
Waldie
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Roe for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.
Mr. Gunter for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.
Mr. Landrum for, with Mr. Hanna against.
Mr. Fisher for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.
Mr. Stark for, with Mr. Podell against.
Mr. Flowers for, with Mr. Brasco against.
Mr. Carney of Ohio for, with Mr. Hawkins against.
Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Metcalfe against.
Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Leggett against.
Mr. Grover for, with Mr. Patman against.
Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Roybal against.
Mr. Bell for, with Mrs. Schroeder against.
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Waldie against.
Mr. Myers for, with Mr. Riegle against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Abdnor.
Mr. Bowen with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Clancy with Mr. Kling.
Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Lott.
Mr. Roncallo of New York with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Fish with Mr. Madigan.
Mr. Frenzel with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.
Mr. Pettis with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Skubitz with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Symms with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Winn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill H.R. 9360 with amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments: Page 5, in line 23, strike out "\$115,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$90,000,000".

Page 6, in line 9, strike out "\$93,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$60,000,000".

Page 6, in line 19, strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 183, present 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—188

Abzug
Addabbo
Anderson,
Calif.
Annunzio
Armstrong
Ashley
Badillo
Barrett
Bergland
Biaggi
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Breckinridge
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Burke, Calif.
Burton
Carey, N.Y.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chisholm
Clay
Cohen
Collins, Ill.
Conable
Conte
Corman
Cotter
Coughlin
Cronin
Culver
Daniels,
Dominick V.
Danielson
Dellenback
Dellums
Diggs
Dingell
Drinan
Donohue
Drinan
du Pont
Eckhardt
Ellberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fascell
Findley
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gialmo
Gonzalez
Grasso
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gude
Hamilton
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington

Gonzalez
Grasso
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Guyer
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Harrington
Harvey
Hebert
Heckler, Mass.
Helms
Helstoski
Hollifield
Holtzman
Hosmer
Howard
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jordan
Karth
Keating
Kemp
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyros
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Long, Md.
McClory
McCloskey
McDade
McEwen
McFall
McKay
McKinney
Madden
Mahon
Mallard
Mallory
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
Mayne
Mazzoli
Meeds
Melcher
Mezvinisky
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix

O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Peyser
Preyer
Price, Ill.
Pritchard
Quile
Rallsback
Rangel
Rees
Reid
Reuss
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Robison, N.Y.
Rodino
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sarasin
Sarbanes
Schneebell
Sebelius
Seiberling
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stanton,
J. William
Steele
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Sullivan
Symington
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Walsh
Ware
Whalen
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles, Tex.
Wolff
Wright
Wyder
Yates
Yatron
Young, Ga.
Young, Ill.
Zablocki

NAYS—183

Adams
Alexander
Andrews, N.C.
Archer
Ashbrook
Aspin
Bafalis
Baker
Beard
Bennett
Bevill
Bray

H 6748

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 26, 1973

Breaux
Brinkley
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Butler
Byron
Carter
Casey, Tex.
Chappell
Clark
Clausen
Clausen, Don H.
Clewson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Collins, Tex.
Conlan
Crane
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.
Davis, Ga.
Davis, S.C.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Denholm
Dennis
Dent
Derwinski
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eshleman
Evins, Tenn.
Flynt
Ford
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frey
Froehlich
Fulton
Gaydos
Ginn
Goldwater
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Haley

Hammer-schmidt
Hanrahan
Hansen, Wash.
Hartsa
Hastings
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Hicks
Hillis
Hinschaw
Hogan
Holt
Huber
Hudnut
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Johnson, Colo.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Kastner
Kazen
Ketchum
Latta
Lifton
Long, La.
Lujan
McCollister
McCormack
McSpadden
Macdonald
Marasiti
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, N.C.
Mathis, Ga.
Miller
Mizell
Molohan
Montgomery
Moorhead, Calif.
Mess
Natcher
Nichols
Obey
Owens
Parris
Passman
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Powell, Ohio
Price, Tex.
Quillen

Ranfall
Rarick
Roberts
Robinson, Va.
Rogers
Roncallo, Wyo.
Rose
Roush
Rousselot
Roy
Runnels
Ruth
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Scherle
Shipley
Shoup
Shuster
Sikes
Slack
Snyder
Spence
Staggers
Stanton
James V.
Steed
Steelman
Steiger, Ariz.
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Studds
Talcott
Taylor, Mo.
Taylor, N.C.
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Thone
Thornton
Towall, Nev.
Treen
Veysey
Waggonner
Wampler
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wilson
Charles H., Calif.
Wyatt
Wylie
Wynnan
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, S.C.
Young, Tex.
Zion
Zwach

PRESENT—1

Michel

NOT VOTING—61

Abdnor
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Beli
Bowen
Brasco
Brotzman
Camp
Carney, Ohio
Clancy
Collier
Conyers
Devine
Dickinson
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Ford, Gerald R.
Frenzel

Fuqua
Gettys
Gibbons
Griffiths
Grover
Gunter
Hanna
Hawkins
Horton
King
Kluczyński
Landgrebe
Landrum
Lott
Madigan
Metcalfe
Milford
Mills, Ark.
Minshall, Ohio
Myers
Patman

Pettis
Podell
Regula
Riegle
Roe
Roncallo, N.Y.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roybal
Schroeder
Shriver
Skubitz
Stark
Stephens
Symms
Thompson, N.J.
Waldie
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Gunter against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Landrum against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Kluczyński for, with Mr. Roe against.

Mr. Podell for, with Mr. Stark against.

Mr. Brasco for, with Mr. Flowers against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Carney of Ohio against.

Mr. Metcalfe for, with Mr. Gettys against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Fuqua against.

Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota against.

Mr. Patman for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Roybal for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mrs. Schroeder for, with Mr. Pettis against.

Mr. Waldie for, with Mr. Shriver against.

Mr. Riegle for, with Mr. Skubitz against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Abdnor against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Roncallo of New York against.

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Grover against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Myers against.

Mr. Brotzman for, with Mr. Symms against.

Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Frenzel for, with Mr. King against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bowen with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Lott.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Madigan.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Winn.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 506, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1443.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MORGAN

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORGAN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1443 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 9360, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973".

CHANGES OF TITLE OF ACT AND NAME OF AGENCY
SEC. 2. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(a) In the first section, strike out "this Act may be cited as 'The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961'" and insert in lieu thereof "this Act may be cited as the 'Mutual Development and Cooperation Act'". The amendment made by this subsection shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Strike out "Agency for International Development" each place it appears in such Act and insert in lieu thereof in each such place "Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency".

POLICY; DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 3. Chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(a) In the chapter heading, immediately after "CHAPTER 1—POLICY" insert "; DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATIONS".

(b) In section 102, relating to statement of policy, insert "(a)" immediately after "STATEMENT OF POLICY.—", and at the end thereof add the following:

"(b) The Congress further finds and declares that, with the help of United States economic assistance, progress has been made in creating a basis for the peaceful advance of the less developed countries. At the same time, the conditions which shaped the United States foreign assistance program in the past have changed. While the United States must continue to seek increased cooperation and

mutually beneficial relations with other nations, our relations with the less developed countries must be revised to reflect the new realities. In restructuring our relationships with those countries, the President should place appropriate emphasis on the following criteria:

(1) Bilateral development aid should concentrate increasingly on sharing American technical expertise, farm commodities, and industrial goods to meet critical development problems, and less on large-scale capital transfers, which when made should be in association with contributions from other industrialized countries working together in a multilateral framework.

(2) Future United States bilateral support for development should focus on critical problems in those functional sectors which affect the lives of the majority of the people in the developing countries: food production, rural development, and nutrition; population planning and health; education, public administration, and human resource development.

(3) United States cooperation in development should be carried out to the maximum extent possible through the private sector, particularly those institutions which already have ties in the developing areas, such as educational institutions, cooperatives, credit unions, and voluntary agencies.

(4) Development planning must be the responsibility of each sovereign country. United States assistance should be administered in a collaborative style to support the development goals chosen by each country receiving assistance.

(5) United States bilateral development assistance should give the highest priority to undertakings submitted by host governments which directly improve the lives of the poorest majority of people and their capacity to participate in the development of their countries.

(6) United States development assistance should continue to be available through bilateral channels units. It is clear that multilateral channels exist which can do the job with no loss of development momentum.

(7) The economic and social development programs to which the United States lends support should reflect, to the maximum extent practicable, the role of United States private investment in such economic and social development program, and arrangements should be continually sought to provide stability and protection for such private investment.

(8) Under the policy guidance of the Secretary of State, the Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency should have the responsibility for coordinating all United States development-related activities.

(c) At the end thereof, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 103. FOOD AND NUTRITION.—In order to prevent starvation, hunger, and malnutrition, and to provide basic services to the people living in rural areas and enhance their capacity for self-help, the President is authorized to furnish assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for agriculture, rural development, and nutrition. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$300,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 104. POPULATION PLANNING AND HEALTH.—In order to increase the opportunities and motivation for family planning, to reduce the rate of population growth, to prevent and combat disease, and to help provide health services for the great majority, the President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for population planning

July 26, 1973

H 6749

and health. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$150,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 105. EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.—In order to reduce illiteracy, to extend basic education, and to increase manpower training in skills related to development, the President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, for education, public administration, and human resource development. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$90,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 106. SELECTED DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to help solve economic and social development problems in fields such as transportation and power, industry, urban development, and export development. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 107. SELECTED COUNTRIES AND ORGANIZATIONS.—The President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in support of the general economy of recipient countries or for development programs conducted by private or international organizations. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 108. APPLICATION OF EXISTING PROVISIONS.—Assistance under this chapter shall be furnished in accordance with the provisions of title I, II, VI, or X of chapter 2 of this part, and nothing in this chapter shall be construed to make inapplicable the restrictions, criteria, authorities, or other provisions of this or any other Act in accordance with which assistance furnished under this chapter would otherwise have been provided.

"SEC. 109. TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding the preceding section, whenever the President determines it to be necessary for the purposes of this chapter, not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available for any provision of this chapter may be transferred to, and consolidated with, the funds made available for any other provision of this chapter, and may be used for any of the purposes for which such funds may be used, except that the total in the provision for the benefit of which the transfer is made shall not be increased by more than 25 per centum of the amount of funds made available for such provision."

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 4. Section 203 of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to fiscal provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended," and insert in lieu thereof "predecessor foreign assistance legislation".

(b) Strike out "for the fiscal year 1970, for the fiscal year 1971, for the fiscal year 1972, and for the fiscal year 1973 for use for the purposes of this title, for loans under title VI, and for the purposes of section 232" and insert in lieu thereof "for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 for use for the purposes of

chapter 1 of this part and part VI of this Act."

TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

SEC. 5. Title II of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to technical cooperation and development grants, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 211(a), relating to general authority, in the last sentence immediately after the word "assistance" insert the word "directly".

(b) In section 214, relating to authorization for American schools and hospitals abroad, strike out subsections (c) and (d) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) To carry out the purposes of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1974, \$20,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975, \$20,000,000, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1974, \$7,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975, \$7,000,000, in foreign currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

"(e) Amounts appropriated under this section shall not be used to furnish assistance under this section in any fiscal year to more than four institutions in the same country, and not more than one such institution shall be a university and not more than one such institution shall be a hospital."

HOUSING GUARANTEES

SEC. 6. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to housing guarantees, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 221, relating to worldwide housing guarantees, strike out "\$205,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$305,000,000".

(b) In section 223(1), relating to general provisions, strike out "June 30, 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1976".

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 7. Title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 235(a)(4), relating to issuing authority of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, strike out "June 30, 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

(b) In section 240(h), relating to agricultural credit and self-help community development projects, strike out "June 30, 1973" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

SEC. 8. Section 252(b) of title VI of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization of appropriations, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1974, \$968,000, and for the fiscal year 1975, \$968,000, for grants to the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance, Inc. in accordance with the purposes of this title."

PROGRAMS RELATING TO POPULATION GROWTH

SEC. 9. Section 292 of title X of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "1972 and 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974 and 1975".

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 10. Chapter 3 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to international organizations and programs, is amended as follows:

(a) At the end of section 301, relating to general authority, add the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) In the case of the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, including the International Atomic Energy Agency, the President shall, acting through the United States representative to such organizations, propose and actively seek the establishment by the governing authorities of such organizations a single professionally qualified group of appropriate size for the purpose of providing an independent and continuous program of selective examination, review, and evaluation of the program and activities of such organizations. Such proposal shall provide that such group shall be established in accordance with such terms of reference as such governing authority may prescribe and that the reports of such group on each examination, review, and evaluation shall be submitted directly to such governing authority for transmittal to the representative of each individual member nation. Such proposal shall further include a statement of auditing and reporting standards, as prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States, for the consideration of the governing authority of the international organization concerned to assist in formulating terms of reference for such review and evaluation group.

"(2) In the case of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Asian Development Bank, the President shall, acting through the United States representative to such organizations, propose and actively seek the establishment by the governing authorities of such organizations professionally qualified groups of appropriate size for the purpose of providing independent and continuous program of selective examination, review, and evaluation of the program and activities of such organizations. Such proposal shall provide that such groups shall be established in accordance with such terms of reference as such governing authorities may prescribe and that the reports of such groups on each examination, review, and evaluation shall be submitted directly to such governing authority for transmittal to the representative of each individual member nation. Such proposal shall further include a statement of auditing and reporting standards, as prepared by the Comptroller General of the United States, for the consideration of the governing authority of the international organization concerned to assist in formulating terms of reference for such review and evaluation groups.

"(3) Reports received by the United States representatives to these international organizations under this subsection and related information on actions taken as a result of recommendations made therein shall be submitted promptly to the President for transmittal to the Congress and to the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General shall periodically review such reports and related information and shall report simultaneously to the Congress and to the President any suggestions the Comptroller General may deem appropriate concerning auditing and reporting standards followed by such groups, the recommendations made and actions taken as a result of such recommendations."

(b) In section 302(a), strike out "for the fiscal year 1972, \$138,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1973, \$138,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "for the fiscal year 1974, \$127,800,000 and for the fiscal year 1975, such sums as may be necessary".

(c) In section 302(b)(2), strike out "for use in the fiscal year 1972, \$15,000,000, and for use in the fiscal year 1973, \$15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for use in the fiscal year 1974, \$15,000,000, and for use in the fiscal year 1975, \$15,000,000."

(d) Section 302(d) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Of the funds provided to carry out the provisions of this chapter for each of

the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$18,000,000 shall be available in each such fiscal year only for contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund."

(e) In section 302(e), strike out "\$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972 and \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974 and \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1975".

CONTINGENCY FUND

Sec. 11. Subsection (a) of section 451 of chapter 5 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to the contingency fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "for the fiscal year 1972 not to exceed \$30,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1973 not to exceed \$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$30,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed \$30,000,000".

(b) Strike out the proviso contained in the first sentence of such subsection and at the end of such subsection add the following: "In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this subsection there are authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be required from time to time to provide relief, rehabilitation, and related assistance in the case of extraordinary disaster situations. Amounts appropriated under this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended."

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

Sec. 12. (a) Section 481 of chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to international narcotics control, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL—" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Not later than forty-five days after the date on which each calendar quarter of each year ends, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a report on the programing and obligation, per calendar quarter, of funds under this chapter prior to such date.

"(2) Not later than forty-five days after the date on which the second calendar quarter of each year ends and not later than forty-five days after the date on which the fourth calendar quarter of each year ends, the President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a complete and detailed semiannual report on the activities and operations carried out under this chapter prior to such date. Such semiannual report shall include, but shall not be limited to—

"(A) the status of each agreement concluded prior to such date with other countries to carry out the purposes of this chapter; and

"(B) the aggregate of obligations and expenditures made, and the types and quantity of equipment provided, per calendar quarter, prior to such date—

"(i) to carry out the purposes of this chapter with respect to each country and each international organization receiving assistance under this chapter, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out such purposes in each such country and with each such international organization;

"(ii) to carry out each program conducted under this chapter in each country and by each international organization, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out each such program; and

"(iii) for administrative support services within the United States to carry out the purposes of this chapter, including the cost of United States personnel engaged in carrying out such purposes in the United States."

(b) Section 482 of chapter 8 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "\$42,500,000" and all that follows down

through the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Sec. 13. Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 10—COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC EXPANSION

"Sec. 490. COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC EXPANSION.—The President is authorized to use up to \$2,000,000 of the funds made available for the purposes of this part in each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 to assist friendly countries, especially those in which United States development programs have been concluded or those not receiving assistance under section 211, in the procurement of technical assistance from United States public or private agencies or individuals. Assistance under this chapter shall be for the purpose of (1) encouraging development of natural resources of interest to the United States, (2) encouragement of a climate favorable to mutually profitable trade and development, and (3) stimulation of markets for United States exports. Any funds used for purposes of this section may be provided on a loan or grant basis and may be used notwithstanding any other provision of this Act."

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Sec. 14. Chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 504(a), relating to authorization, strike out "\$500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972" and insert in lieu thereof "\$550,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974".

(b) In section 506(a), relating to special authority, strike out the words "the fiscal year 1972" wherever they appear and insert in lieu thereof "the fiscal year 1974".

(c) Section 513 is amended—

(1) by striking out "THAILAND—" in the section heading and inserting in lieu thereof "THAILAND, LAOS, and VIETNAM—(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) After June 30, 1974, no military assistance shall be furnished by the United States to Laos or Vietnam directly or through any other foreign country unless that assistance is authorized under this Act or the Foreign Military Sales Act."

(d) Section 514 is repealed.

SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

Sec. 15. Section 532 of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1972 not to exceed \$618,000,000, of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$125,000,000 of which not less than \$50,000,000 shall be available solely for Israel".

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Sec. 16. (a) Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 5—INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

"Sec. 541. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—The purpose of this chapter is to establish an international military education and training program which will—

"(1) improve the ability of friendly foreign countries, through effective military education and training programs relating particularly to United States military methods, procedures, and techniques, to utilize their own resources and equipment and systems of United States origin with maximum effectiveness for the maintenance of their defense

strength and internal security, thereby contributing to enhanced professional military capability and to greater self-reliance by the armed forces of such countries;

"(2) encourage effective and mutually beneficial relationships and enhance understanding between the United States and friendly foreign countries in order to maintain and foster the environment of international peace and security essential to social, economic, and political progress; and

"(3) promote increased understanding by friendly foreign countries of the policies and objectives of the United States in pursuit of the goals of world peace and security."

"Sec. 542. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized in furtherance of the purposes of this chapter, to provide military education and training by grant, contract, or otherwise, including—

"(1) attendance by military and related civilian personnel of friendly foreign countries at military educational and training facilities in the United States (other than the Service Academies) and abroad;

"(2) attendance by military and related civilian personnel of friendly foreign countries in special courses of instruction at schools and institutions of learning or research in the United States and abroad;

"(3) observation and orientation visits by foreign military and related civilian personnel to military facilities and related activities in the United States and abroad; and

"(4) activities that will otherwise assist and encourage the development and improvement of the military education and training of members of the armed forces and related civilian personnel of friendly foreign countries so as to further the purposes of this chapter, including but not limited to the assignment of noncombatant military training instructors, and the furnishing of training aids, technical, educational and informational publications and media of all kinds."

"Sec. 543. AUTHORIZATION.—To carry out the purposes of this chapter, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974. Amounts appropriated under this section are authorized to remain available until expended."

"Sec. 544. ANNUAL REPORTS.—The President shall submit no later than December 31 each year a report to the Congress of activities carried on and obligations incurred during the immediately preceding fiscal year in furtherance of the purposes of this chapter. Each such report shall contain a full description of the program and the funds obligated with respect to each country concerning which activities have been carried on in furtherance of the purposes of this chapter."

(b) The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 503(d), relating to general authority, is amended by striking out the comma and the words "including those relating to training or advice".

(2) Section 504(a), relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "(other than training in the United States)".

(3) Section 510, relating to restrictions on training foreign military students, is repealed.

(4) Section 622, relating to coordination with foreign policy, is amended as follows:

(A) In subsection (b) immediately after the phrase "(including civic action)" insert the words "and military education and training".

(B) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Under the direction of the President, the Secretary of State shall be responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of economic assistance, military assistance and military education and training programs, including but not limited to determining whether there shall be a military assistance (including civic action) or a military education and training program for a

July 26, 1973

country and the value thereof, to the end that such programs are effectively integrated both at home and abroad and the foreign policy of the United States is best served thereby."

(5) Section 623, relating to the Secretary of Defense, is amended as follows:

(A) In subsection (a) (4), immediately after the word "military", insert the words "and related civilian".

(B) In subsection (a) (6), immediately after the word "assistance", insert a comma and the words "education and training".

(6) Section 632, relating to allocation and reimbursement among agencies, is amended by inserting in subsections (a), (b), and (c) immediately after the word "articles", wherever it appears, a comma and the words "military education and training".

(7) Section 636, relating to provisions on uses of funds, is amended as follows:

(A) In subsection (g) (1), immediately after the word "articles", insert a comma and the words "military education and training".

(B) In subsection (g) (2), strike out the word "personnel" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and related civilian personnel".

(8) Section 644, relating to definitions, is amended as follows:

(A) Subsection (f) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) 'Defense service' includes any service, test, inspection, repair, publication, or technical or other assistance or defense information used for the purposes of furnishing military assistance, but shall not include military educational and training activities under chapter 5 of part II."

(B) There is added at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) 'Military education and training' includes formal or informal instruction of foreign students in the United States or overseas by officers or employees of the United States, contract technicians, contractors (including instruction at civilian institutions), or by correspondence courses, technical, educational, or information publications and media of all kinds, training aids, orientation, and military advice to foreign military units and forces."

(c) Except as may be expressly provided to the contrary in this Act, all determinations, authorizations, regulations, orders, contracts, agreements, and other actions issued, undertaken or entered into under authority of any provision of law amended or repealed by this section shall continue in full force and effect until modified by appropriate authority.

(d) Funds made available pursuant to other provisions of law for foreign military educational and training activities shall remain available for obligation and expenditure for their original purposes in accordance with the provisions of law originally applicable thereto, or in accordance with the provisions of law currently applicable to those purposes.

PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 17. (a) Section 620(e) of chapter 1 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to expropriation, is amended by striking out paragraph (1), by striking out "(2)" at the beginning of paragraph (2), and by striking out "subsection: *Provided*, That this subparagraph" and inserting in lieu thereof "section (as in effect before the date of the enactment of the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973): *Provided*, That this subsection".

(b) Section 620(n) of such chapter, relating to equipment materials or commodities furnished to North Vietnam, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "unless the President finds and reports, within thirty days of such finding, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign

Affairs of the House that such assistance is in the national interest of the United States.

The President's report shall contain assurances that the Government of North Vietnam is cooperating fully in providing for a full accounting of any remaining prisoners of war and all missing in action."

(c) Section 620 of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(x) No assistance shall be furnished under this or any other Act to any country which has—

"(1) nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens;

"(2) taken steps to repudiate or nullify existing contracts or agreements with any United States citizen or any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum of which is beneficially owned by United States citizens; or

"(3) imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, or has taken other actions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned;

unless the President determines that (A) an arrangement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation has been made, (B) the parties have submitted the dispute to arbitration under the rules of the Convention for the Settlement of Investment Disputes, or (C) good faith negotiations are in progress aimed at providing prompt, adequate, and effective compensation under the applicable principles of international law."

EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

SEC. 18. Section 625 of chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to employment of personnel, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) (1) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, the following categories of personnel who serve in the Agency for International Development shall become participants in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System:

"(A) Persons serving under unlimited appointments in employment subject to section 625(d) (2) of this Act as Foreign Service Reserve officers and as Foreign Service staff officers and employees; and

"(B) A person serving in a position to which he was appointed by the President, whether with or without the advice and consent of the Senate, provided that (1) such person shall have served previously under an unlimited appointment pursuant to said section 625(d) (2) or a comparable provision of predecessor legislation to this Act, and (2) following service specified in proviso (1) such person shall have served continuously with the Agency for International Development or its predecessor agencies only in positions established under the authority of sections 624(a) and 631(b) or comparable provisions of predecessor legislation to this Act.

"(2) Upon becoming a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, any such officer or employee shall make a special contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 852 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. Thereafter, compulsory contributions will be made with respect to each such participating officer or employee in accordance with the provisions of section 811 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"(3) The provisions of section 636 and title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall apply to participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability

System by any such officer or employee.

"(4) If an officer who became a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, to a position in any Government agency, any United States delegation or mission to any international organization, in any international commission, or in any international body, such officer shall not, by virtue of the acceptance of such an appointment, lose his status as a participant in the system.

"(5) Any such officer or employee who becomes a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be mandatorily retired (a) at the end of the month in which he reaches age seventy or (b) earlier if, during the third year after the effective date of this subsection, he attains age sixty-four or if he is over age sixty-four; during the fourth year at age sixty-three; during the fifth year at age sixty-two; during the sixth year at age sixty-one; and thereafter at the end of the month in which he reaches age sixty: *Provided*, That no participant shall be mandatorily retired under this paragraph while serving in a position to which appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Any participant who completes a period of authorized service after reaching the mandatory retirement age specified in this paragraph shall be retired at the end of the month in which such service is completed.

"(6) Whenever the President deems it to be in the public interest, he may extend any participant's service for a period not to exceed five years after the mandatory retirement date of such officer or employee.

"(7) This subsection shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins more than one year after the date of its enactment, except that any officer or employee who, before such effective date, meets the requirements for participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection may elect to become a participant before the effective date of this subsection. Such officer or employee shall become a participant on the first day of the second month following the date of his application for earlier participation. Any officer or employee who becomes a participant in the system under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, who is age fifty-seven or over on the effective date of this subsection, may retire voluntarily at any time before mandatory retirement under paragraph (5) of this subsection and receive retirement benefits under section 821 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"(8) Any officer or employee who is separated for cause while a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System pursuant to this subsection, shall be entitled to benefits in accordance with subsections 637 (b) and (d) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. The provisions of section 625(e) of this Act shall apply to participants in lieu of the provisions of sections 633 and 634 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended."

REPORTS AND INFORMATION

SEC. 19. (a) Section 634 of chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to reports and information, is amended by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) The President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, a comprehensive report showing, as of June 30 and December 31 of each year, the status of each loan, and each contract of guarantee or insurance, theretofore made under this Act, with respect to which there

July 26, 1973

H 6752

remains outstanding any unpaid obligation or potential liability; the status of each sale of defense articles or defense services on credit terms, and each contract of guarantee in connection with any such sale, theretofore made under the Foreign Military Sales Act, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation or potential liability; the status of each sale of agricultural commodities on credit terms theretofore made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation; and the status of each transaction in which a loan, contract of guarantee or insurance, or extension of credit (or participation therein) was theretofore made under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, with respect to which there remains outstanding any unpaid obligation or potential liability: *Provided, however*, That this report individually only those loans, contracts, sales, extensions of credit, or other transactions listed above in excess of \$1,000,000.

"(g) The President shall transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, not later than January 31 of each year, a comprehensive report, based upon the latest data available, showing—

"(1) a summary of the worldwide dimensions of debt-servicing problems among such countries, together with a detailed statement of the debt-servicing problems of each such country;

"(2) a summary of all forms of debt relief granted by the United States with respect to such countries, together with a detailed statement of the specific debt relief granted with respect to each such country and the purpose for which it was granted;

"(3) a summary of the worldwide effect of the debt relief granted by the United States on the availability of funds, authority, or other resources of the United States to make any such loan, sale, contract of guarantee or insurance, or extension of credit, together with a detailed statement of the effect of such debt relief with respect to each such country; and

"(4) a summary of the net aid flow from the United States to such countries, taking into consideration the debt relief granted by the United States, together with a detailed analysis of such net aid flow with respect to each such country."

(b) (1) The President of the United States shall, as soon as practicable following the date of the enactment of this Act, make a determination and report to Congress with respect to the use by Portugal in support of its military activities in its African colonies of—

(A) assistance furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 after the date of the enactment of the Mutual Development and Cooperation Act of 1973.

(B) defense articles or services furnished after such date under the Foreign Military Sales Act (whether for cash or by credit, guarantee or any other means), or

(C) agricultural commodities furnished after such date under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

"(2) Any assistance or sales referred to in the preceding paragraph shall be suspended upon the submission to Congress of a report by the President containing his determination that any such assistance or item so furnished after such date has been used in support of Portugal's military activities in its African colonies. Such suspension shall continue until such time as the President submits a report to Congress containing his determination that appropriate corrective action has been taken by the Government of Portugal.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Sec. 20. Section 637(a) of chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,

relating to authorizations for administrative expenses, is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1973, \$50,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1973, \$50,000,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year 1974, \$53,100,000 and for the fiscal year 1975, \$53,100,000".

FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF AND AFRICAN SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 21. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out section 639 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 639. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF.—Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other Act, the President is authorized to furnish famine or disaster relief or rehabilitation or related assistance abroad on such terms and conditions as he may determine.

"SEC. 639A. FAMINE AND DISASTER RELIEF TO THE AFRICAN SAHEL.—(a) The Congress affirms the response of the United States Government in providing famine and disaster relief and related assistance in connection with the drought in the Sahelian nations of Africa.

"(b) Notwithstanding any prohibitions or restrictions contained in this or any other Act, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$30,000,000 to remain available until expended, for use by the President, under such terms and conditions as he may determine, for emergency and recovery needs, including drought, famine, and disaster relief, and rehabilitation and related assistance, for the drought-stricken Sahelian nations of Africa.

"SEC. 639B. AFRICAN SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Congress supports the initiative of the United States Government in undertaking consultations and planning with the countries concerned, with other nations providing assistance, with the United Nations, and with other concerned international and regional organizations, toward the development and support of a comprehensive long-term African Sahel development program."

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 22. Chapter 2 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to administrative provisions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 640B. COORDINATION.—(a) The President shall establish a system for coordination of United States policies and programs which affect United States interests in the development of low-income countries. To that end, the President shall establish a Development Coordination Committee which shall advise him with respect to coordination of United States policies and programs affecting the development of the developing countries, including programs of bilateral and multilateral development assistance. The Committee shall include the Administrator, Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency, Chairman; and representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and the Executive Office of the President, and other executive departments and agencies, as the President shall designate.

"(b) The President shall prescribe appropriate procedures to assure coordination among the various departments and agencies of the United States Government having representatives in diplomatic missions abroad.

"(c) Programs authorized by this Act shall be undertaken with the foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State.

"(d) The President shall report to the Congress during the first quarter of each calendar year on United States actions affecting the development of the low-income countries and on the impact of those undertakings upon the national income, employment, wages and working conditions in the United States.

"SEC. 640C. SHIPPING DIFFERENTIAL.—For the purpose of facilitating implementation of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act,

1936 (49 Stat. 1985; 46 U.S.C. 1241(b)), funds made available for the purposes of chapter 1 of part I or for purposes of part VI may be used to make grants to recipients under this part to pay all or any portion of such differential as is determined by the Secretary of Commerce to exist between United States and foreign-flag vessel charter or freight rates. Grants made under this section shall be paid with United States-owned foreign currencies wherever feasible."

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 23. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to miscellaneous provisions, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 659. ANNUAL NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY MILITARY ORGANIZATION REPORT.—(a) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate, on or before January 15 of each year a report of—

"(1) the direct, indirect, and unallocated costs to the United States of participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Organization') for the last fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the report is submitted;

"(2) the estimated direct, indirect, and unallocated costs to the United States of participation in the Organization for the fiscal year in which the report is submitted;

"(3) the amounts requested from Congress (or estimated to be requested) for the direct, indirect, and unallocated costs to the United States of participation in the Organization for the first fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the report is submitted;

"(4) the estimated impact of expenditures related to United States participation in the Organization on the United States balance of payments including a detailed description of the offsets to such United States expenditures.

For each such direct, indirect, and unallocated cost, the Acts of Congress authorizing such cost and appropriating funds for such cost shall be listed next to such cost in the report.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'direct costs' includes funds the United States contributes directly to any budget of the Organization (including the infrastructure program);

"(2) the term 'indirect costs' includes funds the United States spends to assign and maintain United States civilian employees for the Organization, funds spent for Government research and development attributable to the Organization, contributions to the Organization sponsored organizations, and military assistance furnished under part II of this Act, and sales of defense articles or defense services under the Foreign Military Sales Act, to member nations of the Organization; and

"(3) the term 'unallocated costs' includes (i) funds the United States spends to maintain United States Armed Forces committed exclusively or primarily for the Organization in Europe, the United States, or on the open seas, or to remove such Armed Forces from such commitment, and (ii) funds the United States spends on facilities constructed and maintained for such forces.

"(c) All information contained in any report transmitted under this section shall be public information, except information that the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of State designates in such report as information required to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy.

INDOCHINA POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

Sec. 24. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

Mr. Johnson, owner of Roger's Service in Detroit, said that he had used up his September allocation of oil in two weeks.

A large number of suppliers have discontinued operations in parts of Michigan, and their competitors do not have enough oil to serve new customers. In fact, most heating oil dealers in the state have imposed a moratorium on new customers. Some are even extending it to people who purchase homes previously served by the company.

The Amoco division of the Standard Oil Company (Indiana) indicated that it intended to continue supply its present customers but warned that there could be difficulties if the weather turned unseasonably cold.

An independent dealer in Livonia, Mich., said that concern over a possible fuel oil shortage was a fabrication of the people "who put out the newspapers."

A spokesman for the State Task Force on Fuel Supply said that, "given an average winter, demand for heating oil statewide will exceed supply by about 1 per cent." The task force was formed last winter to coordinate heating oil resources. It has since developed a voluntary distribution system.

KANSAS CITY

Independent suppliers of home heating oil in the Missouri area say that future deliveries are uncertain, but most are expecting significant reductions.

"A lot of people are going to be cold this winter," said Mrs. Ruth Hill, operator of the Hill Oil Company, one of the largest dealers of fuel oil for residential use in the area.

Actually, about 90 per cent of the homes and buildings in the vicinity use natural gas for heating. Hence, the prospective scarcity of fuel oil this winter will not be as serious here as in other parts of the country.

Aggravating the potential problem, however, is the scarcity of natural gas, which will probably force some utilities to convert to oil as a means of generating power.

Spokesmen for the Gas Service Company say they expect to run about 10 per cent short on their commercial customers' demand for natural gas. The slack, they add, will have to be made up with either fuel oil or propane.

Last winter was relatively severe in the Kansas City area and independent jobbers were on allocation for fuel oil from January to April, forcing them to cut back on industrial customers.

This year could be worse. Reserves are lower because of the increased demand for fuel oil this summer, when many users were required to conserve gas.

GENE SALORIO.

MANDATORY FUEL CONTROLS

Mr. HANSEN, Mr. President, it may be that the President's energy adviser, John A. Love, had no alternative but to announce implementation of mandatory allocation programs for heating fuel and propane gas.

But those who have been demanding a mandatory program in place of the voluntary program are the same ones who earlier this year were saying that gasoline shortages were contrived by the oil companies to drive prices up and that the so-called energy crisis was a conspiracy among the major oil companies.

The same ones were saying—and some of them still are—that there is no real natural gas shortage but that the larger gas producers were and are withholding gas reserves from the interstate market or selling their gas to intrastate markets for twice the price they were allowed under FPC regulations.

In fact, one of these gentlemen from New England went down to Alabama last week to urge the southern Governors in conference there to support mandatory fuel allocation legislation.

He accused the Nixon administration of indecision and inaction and warned of an impending energy shortage, particularly in his home State of Massachusetts and other northeastern States. This same gentleman, who is chairman of a House subcommittee on power, has been sitting on legislation for 2 years that could have freed up additional gas supplies and offered incentives to oil and gas producers to explore for and develop critically needed new supplies of natural gas and oil.

Only a year ago, other Congressmen and Senators from the northeastern States were clamoring for an end to oil import quotas in favor of unlimited imports of foreign oil and oil products.

Now that foreign oil, residual and heating oil is higher than the domestic product they want a mandatory allocation program so they can share in the shortage of "cheap" domestic oil.

At the Southern Governor's Conference last week, the Governors of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Mississippi threatened to cut off gas to northeastern States unless those States took steps to increase refining capacity and allow offshore exploration for oil and gas.

The four Governors warned that they had the police powers to regulate where gas produced in those States goes. Governor Edwards said he was no longer willing for Louisiana to deplete its natural resources and damage its environment when northeastern States balked at new refinery construction and offshore exploration.

I fully agree with the four Southern Governors and I believe our own Governor of Wyoming, Stan Hathaway, also agrees with them.

We are both fed up with the idea of the New England States, and other northeastern States trying to have the best of all possible worlds by having us, the energy-producing States, supply the energy and seeing that the tougher State standards we might want to protect our environment are not imposed.

While tougher State environmental standards might increase the cost of the energy they receive from the producing States, if they want that energy, the consuming States in the East should certainly be willing to share in the cost of protecting the environment.

In my judgment, the eastern energy consuming States should pay some of the costs of maintaining the environment of Wyoming and other producing States and the easterns should not expect us to supply them cheap power and fuel at the expense of our environment.

The eastern environmentalists have been adamant in their refusal to allow construction of much needed powerplants, refineries and deepwater ports in their States and they oppose offshore oil and gas drilling in the waters adjoining their States on environmental protection grounds.

But they have a flagrant disregard for the views of those of us in the Western

and Southern producing States who believe that our environment is entitled to a little protection if we are going to continue to provide the energy on which this country runs.

Mandatory fuel allocations will serve the purpose only of sharing the shortage and may be necessary to prevent hardship and suffering in the northeastern States that depend mainly on imported foreign oil for their supplies. But the only real solution is to get on, and quickly, with an accelerated domestic exploration and development program for oil and gas—the only safe and sensible near-term solution of our energy problems.

It is time that we put to rest the ridiculous charge of a contrived shortage and conspiracy and level with our constituents concerning the facts of the energy problem. It is time that we got the message across that the days of cheap gas, gasoline, and heating oil are over and that the only safe course we can pursue is one of the quickest possible return to substantial energy self-sufficiency. And while that will cost money further dependence on imports will cost more. Some of the advocates of cheap imported oil are now learning about the laws and supply and demand as the Middle East nations, Canada, Venezuela, and all other oil producing countries push their prices higher and higher to whatever the market will bear.

And when a nation is dependent on oil and gas for more than three-fourths of its energy and there is no other place to get it, we have not seen the end of foreign oil prices that have more than doubled in the past year. Where they will stop nobody knows.

Mandatory fuel oil controls share the shortage but will not solve the problem.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 2335, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2335) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), amendment No. 535, on which there will be 1 hour of debate.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 19, line 12, insert the following: "Sec. 16, Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 659. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO PORTUGAL.—(A) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that no military or economic assistance furnished by the United States, nor any items of equipment sold by or exported from the United

States, shall be used to maintain the present status of the African territories of Portugal.

"(B)(1) The President of the United States shall, as soon as practicable following the date of the enactment of this section, make a determination and report to Congress with respect to the use by Portugal in support of its military activities in its African territories of—

"(a) assistance furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, after the date of the enactment of this section;

"(b) defense articles or services furnished after such date under the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended;

"(c) agricultural commodities or local currencies furnished after such date under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, or any other Act; or

"(d) items for which validated export licenses are granted after such date for export to Portugal or its territories.

"(2) The President shall include a report similar to that specified in the previous subsection in each year at the time of submitting the budget request for foreign assistance. Such report shall also specify the steps being taken to implement the policy contained in this section.

"(C) All assistance, sales, and licenses referred to in the preceding paragraph shall be suspended upon the submission to Congress of a report by the President containing his determination that any such assistance, or item so furnished or exported, after such date, has been used in support of Portugal's military activities in its African territories. Such suspension shall continue until such time as the President submits a report to Congress containing his determination that appropriate corrective action has been taken by the Government of Portugal. The authority contained in section 614 of this Act shall not apply to programs terminated by reason of this section."

On page 25, line 21, change "Sec. 16." to "Sec. 17."

On page 28, line 5, change "Sec. 17." to "Sec. 18."

On page 28, line 10, change "Sec. 18." to "Sec. 19."

On page 28, line 20, change "Sec. 19." to "Sec. 20."

On page 29, line 4, change "Sec. 20." to "Sec. 21."

On page 29, line 10, change "Sec. 21." to "Sec. 22."

On page 30, line 4, change "Sec. 22." to "Sec. 23."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time not to be taken out of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the disposition of the amendment by Mr. HELMS, the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) be recognized to call up his amendment No. 579, and that there be a time limit thereon of 30 minutes, to be equally divided in accordance with the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the

disposition of the Eagleton amendment the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be recognized to call up 2 amendments in succession, on each of which there be a time limitation of 30 minutes, to be equally divided in accordance with the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally charged against each side on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the pending amendment be limited to 40 minutes, to be equally divided.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. And I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call which was being charged against the amendment be vitiated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer my amendment No. 535 to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973. Joining me in sponsoring this amendment are Senators HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, MOSS, STEVENSON, ABOUREZK, CRANSTON, and JACKSON.

This amendment will add a new section to the Foreign Assistance Act. It will declare that it is the policy of the United States that no military or economic assistance programs, and no items of equipment sold by or exported from the United States, should be used to maintain the present status of the African territories of Portugal. Presently, Portugal has three territories in Africa—Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau—which are administered from Lisbon, and whose people are denied self-government and freedom.

In order to implement this policy, the President is required, under this amendment, to make a determination and report to the Congress stating whether or not any of the following U.S. programs is being used in support of Portuguese military activities in its African territories:

First, grant economic or military assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Second, sales of military equipment, whether for cash or on credit terms, under the Foreign Military Sales Act.

Third, any agricultural commodities or local currencies generated by the food for peace program, or any other legislation.

Fourth, items of equipment sold pri-

vately by U.S. firms, but which require a validated export license in order to be exported to Portugal or any of its African territories.

Now, the President must assure that all of these programs are being carried out in such a way that they do not support Portuguese military activities in Africa. This really only means a continuation of our present policies, since the U.S. Government has maintained an arms embargo for Southern Africa for over 10 years. Portugal presently certifies that it will not use any U.S. military equipment in Southern Africa. Therefore, this would not affect programs for the NATO defense.

The amendment does provide, however, that U.S. assistance programs should be suspended if the President ever reports that any of these programs or items of equipment are being used by Portugal in support of military actions in Africa. The suspension shall continue until the situation is corrected. If the President carefully reviews U.S. programs and policies and makes sure the Portuguese understand the limits of U.S. assistance, there will be no need for sanctions.

Finally, the amendment requires that the President report annually on his review of U.S. programs, and that he also report to the Congress on the steps being taken to insure compliance with the policy declared in this amendment.

Up to now, American policy regarding Portugal's African territories has been made by the executive branch. This policy has, for the most part, been a good one, denying U.S. aid for Portugal's colonial activities. However, hearings by the African Subcommittee on the House Foreign Affairs Committee raised some questions as to the effectiveness of our arms embargo, and about our policy with Portugal. Accordingly Members of the House of Representatives took the initiative to enact some legislation to firmly prevent U.S. assistance from being used in southern Africa. Representative ANDREW YOUNG offered an amendment very similar to the one I offer today, and it was accepted by the House during debate on the foreign aid bill last July. Now that our sister body has taken action on this important subject, I am asking my colleagues in the Senate to join with the House of Representatives, and adopt this amendment.

The amendment states a principle which is fundamental to America's spirit and at the heart of its deepest instincts: That is the principle of self-determination for all peoples. Our Nation must now allow itself to support a regime and a policy which deny dignity, opportunity, and self-government to some 14 million blacks who live in Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau. The United States has long supported steps to lead to the independence of these territories; numerous resolutions have passed the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly calling on Portugal to negotiate an end to its colonial holdings.

The last point I would make is that this amendment fits in perfectly with the growing congressional movement to re-

store its role in the making of foreign policy. This amendment strikes a balance between the Congress and the President. By this legislation, Congress takes the lead in making a policy statement, but leaves to the President the implementation of that policy. We do not usurp proper Presidential powers, but at the same time, we are announcing that we will not abdicate entirely to the President the formulation of U.S. policy on this important issue. It is also important to note that this amendment is to be implemented by putting restrictions on programs and laws passed by the Congress: The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Foreign Military Sales Act, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, and the Export Administration Act.

Thus, I call on my colleagues to adopt this amendment, which insures that no U.S. assistance or materials will be used to support Portugal's military activities in Africa. This amendment will place the United States legally on record in opposition to a policy which is condemned by virtually every nation in the world. This amendment will be consistent with our present policy toward Portuguese Africa, and will not interfere with legitimate NATO programs which Portugal undertakes. Passage of this amendment will help restore Congress role in making foreign policy. Let us join with the House of Representatives, and present a clear message to all nations that the United States believes in its heritage, believes in allowing all men and women to have the right to choose their political future, and their destiny.

Liberation movements have been active in all three territories for more than a decade. In response, Portugal maintains half its army in Africa, and carries on a brutal, repressive war to maintain its control. Despite a massive effort by Portugal, the liberation movements are growing in strength, and the situation in the territories is more and more approaching large-scale civil war. Just this week, the liberation movement in Guinea-Bissau—which controls more than two-thirds of the area of the territory—declared itself an independent state in its liberated areas, and it is receiving support from many African nations.

This is the blueprint for another Vietnam, another Algeria. The United States must not become involved again in such a civil war. That is what this amendment would prevent.

Not only would the amendment assure no U.S. involvement in a morally abhorrent war; it would have positive benefits as well. It will act as a signal to the nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America that the United States stands firmly on the issue of human rights and human dignity. These nations are important sources of raw materials, and important future trading partners. Good relations are worth making this kind of symbolic statement. Also, passage of this amendment will help the administration to continue its present policy. The Congress will show its strong backing for the policy, and the enactment of legislation makes it easier for the executive branch to resist Portuguese pressure for delivery

of military equipment or other assistance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I want to commend the able Senator from California for this amendment. I was very willing and proud to be a cosponsor when he spoke to me about it. I believe what the Senator is advocating is sound national policy. I believe, also, in signals being raised to the world that we do not want to see the American Government involved on the side of colonial powers in colonial struggles.

We value Portugal as an ally. She is part of NATO. The Senator does not wish to disturb that relationship at all, but he wants to make sure, as I understand the amendment, that our aid is not used in efforts to put down what are called freedom movements or the desire for self-rule on the part of people in Africa and in the Portuguese colonies.

Mr. TUNNEY. Absolutely. That is as well stated as it could be. It would be a similar situation to the time when the United States was declaring its independence from Great Britain, if a country such as France or Italy were to supply arms to the British to be used against the United States. So what we want to do is to preserve our free heritage and not do the same thing which we would have abhorred ourselves two centuries ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, might I make one suggestion to the Senator from California? In looking over the amendment, I find that on page 2, line 6, item (d) running through line 18, language which reads:

Items for which validated export licenses are granted after such date for export to Portugal or its territories.

This does not relate to foreign aid at all. It relates to business, so to speak. It seems to me that that particular section might well be removed from the amendment because the licenses will have to be, first of all, obtained and approved by the State Department. And I believe, in my judgment, that we ought not to be legislating in that type of territory when we are dealing with the Foreign Assistance Act. I wonder if the Senator would be willing to accept a modification and we will then have accomplished our objective and will have seen to it that foreign assistance paid for by the taxpayers of this country is not used in any way for colonial domination.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, subsection (d) simply states what is already part of our governmental policy, and that is not to allow validated export licenses to be used in some way to avoid our arms embargo.

We do have a policy that no export licenses will be granted if it would represent a means of supplying arms to Portuguese territories in southern Africa. Inasmuch as it is a statement of what is already basic policy, I am reluctant to take it out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the Senator properly notes, it is a fact that there is an international arms em-

bargo in southern Africa. I think that our country has made an effort to comply with this embargo. I wish that other countries had done the same.

However, I think it is time for this body to stop beating ourselves as though the United States is a villain in this matter. Other countries have supplied arms and have violated the embargo. We have tried to walk a pretty straight and decent line in this matter.

The State Department requires the assurance of Portugal that American aid and sales will not be used to maintain control in African territories. And the State Department investigates every situation in which American goods are being used for that purpose.

It seems to me that we already have this item covered. This is not in reference to arms. Item (d) refers to items for which validated export licenses are granted after such date for export to Portugal or its territories.

This does not only apply to arms. And that is the danger.

Mr. TUNNEY. That is the whole purpose of including it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator would be willing to limit it and say "validated export licenses for arms —," that would be agreeable.

Mr. TUNNEY. The trouble is that recently some Boeing 707's were sold to the Portuguese Airline, a Government organization. They were put into use as troop transports to carry troops to the territories in Africa. Light aircraft and helicopters were sold to Mozambique, and these planes are being used to transport troops and for reconnaissance.

The point is that we are asking the State and Commerce Departments to review these sales, these export licenses, and to put some pressures to bear in the right quarters to prevent what looks like an innocent sale of equipment, but which turns out to be a sale of equipment which, in fact, is going to be used to help the war effort in Portuguese Africa.

Inasmuch as we have a record of so-called innocent sales which have supported the Portuguese troops in Southern Africa, it seems to me that it would be best to have this provision in the bill, if I could convince my very worthy and able cosponsor, who has been so deeply involved in this foreign aid program.

I recall that the very able junior Senator from Minnesota, as Vice President, was one of those who convinced me to vote for the foreign aid bill 8 years ago when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. I recognized his expertise in this area. However, it would seem to me that it would be best to have this matter covered in the bill and leave implementation to the State and Commerce Departments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on general principle I fully support the amendment. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, and I am deeply committed to the U.S. policy with respect to southern Africa. I am opposed to apartheid. I am opposed to any effort to aid colonial powers who suppress the right of self-determination.

In fact, very shortly, I will be bringing

to the Senate floor a bill which will once again, I hope, restore our embargo on Rhodesian chrome. These are symbolic efforts.

My only point is whether we can clarify the matter in a conference discussion. I prefer to do it here. I would rather change the language where it says "items for which validated export licenses are granted after such date for export to Portugal or its territories." To be more specific and say, "military items or those related to military activities . . ."

I believe that we need to differentiate between items which are strictly for consumer or industrial use and items which are for military use. I know what the purpose of the Senator is. As a matter of fact, we could rewrite that in conference.

Mr. TUNNEY. That would be acceptable, "items for military use."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would prefer to have, "items that have a military application." How is that for language?

Mr. TUNNEY. That is agreeable, "items that have a military application."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That takes care of the point which the Senator has appropriately raised here, the use of planes that appear to be for civilian use, but which are used for military purposes.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I modify section (E) (1) of my amendment to read as follows:

(d) Items that have a military application for which validated export licenses are granted after such date for export to Portugal or its territories.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from California. I was very interested in this. However, I was interested in seeing that we do just what we sought to do, and no less.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California will need unanimous consent to modify his amendment.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified as I have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to yield back my time. Mr. President, before we complete our discussion, I think that this amendment is universally acceptable. Does the Senator feel that he needs a rollcall vote?

Mr. TUNNEY. I do not feel that we need a rollcall vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I can promise the Senator that in the conference we will fight to the end to maintain the provision.

I am thoroughly in agreement with the Senator. And I am sure that the Senate would vote in agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified. (Putting the question.)

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 586

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the amendment (No. 586) of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HELMS's amendment (No. 586) is as follows:

On page 9, line 11, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 9, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 116. PROHIBITING USE OF FUNDS FOR ABORTIONS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this part shall be used in any manner, directly or indirectly, to pay for abortions, abortifacient drugs, or devices, the promotion of the practice of abortion, or the support of research designed to develop methods of abortion. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any funds obligated prior to the date of its enactment."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged equally to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on all further amendments except the Fulbright amendment, there be a time limitation of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided, and in the regular form.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also ask unanimous consent that there be, from this moment on, 2 hours on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 586.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment is the pending business before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HELMS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the light of our discussion, would the Senator like to ask unanimous consent relating to the vacating of the rollcall?

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I do ask unanimous consent that my request for the yeas and nays be vacated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The previous order for the yeas and nays is vacated.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, in the light of a conference with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and others, I am happy to say that I believe I am correct in stating that the Senator from Minnesota has agreed to ac-

cept my amendment, which is cosponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I have indeed. I feel the Senator's amendment has considerable merit to it, and as I said to him, we will accept it and work to have it accepted in conference.

Mr. HELMS. I appreciate that. I do not desire to consume the Senate's time unnecessarily, Mr. President, and if we may have the understanding that my amendment will be supported vigorously in conference, that is satisfactory to me, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator it will be supported vigorously. I am not sure the Senator from Minnesota is always effective, but he is vigorous, and we will do our level best. With the wisdom of the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), perhaps we can do better.

Mr. HELMS. With such a combination, we are bound to win.

Mr. AIKEN. I can assure the Senator from North Carolina that when the Senator from Minnesota gets into conference, he is always vigorous.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of the time on this side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his cooperation and help.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) is on his way to the floor of the Senate. Under the previous order, his amendment would be called up next. However, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) be recognized now for the purpose of calling up an amendment. I understand that his amendment will be accepted. I make this request with the understanding that there will be a limitation of 10 minutes on the Byrd amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of the amendment?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. If the Senator will yield, it is an amendment iden-

tical with the amendment accepted on last Friday on the military procurement authorization bill by a vote of 67 to 18. It probably has more relevance to this measure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the amendment is identical to the amendment we proposed on the military procurement bill, but it does require a conference.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk. I ask that the stating of the amendment be dispensed with but that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. I will explain the amendment briefly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA LOAN SETTLEMENT

The United States Government may not agree to any settlement with the Government of India with respect to sums owed by that Government to the United States Government on sales and loans made pursuant to law, unless—

(1) that settlement provides for the Government of India paying all of such sums owed; or

(2) Congress, by law, specifically authorizes settlement in an amount which is less than all of such sums owed.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the amendment is identical to one that was adopted by the Senate last Friday by a vote of 67 to 18. It would require that any settlement of the \$3 billion that the Government of India owes to the United States must be approved by Congress. It is really the same as appropriating funds, when we cancel a debt that a foreign government owes us.

I am not passing judgment on the merits of the negotiations, but I believe that before we start giving away tax funds, Congress itself should make the decision. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not very enthusiastic about the amendment. The administration is preparing a proposal on how to settle the situation with India, since India owes us a tremendous amount of money. I understand that the interest they pay us on the principle is more than the aid we are giving them year by year. It is almost morally certain they will never be able to pay back the entire amount which they owe us which is now on the books. We have made deals with other countries, particularly Russia, on the aid which we have given them back in World War II days.

While I realize that this amendment will pass the Senate by a one-sided vote, as it did the other day, and, therefore, I am not going to oppose it at this time, I would hope that we will wait to take any positive action until we find out what arrangements can be made with India.

We know that the Indian Government under Mrs. Gandhi is having a pretty difficult time. I would not want her job, I can assure you, Mr. President, of that; but inasmuch as this has already been passed by a one-sided margin before, I will not vote against it now.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished dean of the Senate, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN). It is unfortunate that this amendment was adopted last week. Of course, it would be adopted again if there were a rollcall vote on it.

I do not believe it is helpful at the present time to adopt an amendment which singles out India while the efforts are being made by our new Ambassador to India to do something about the problems that have been created.

I can understand some kind of general policy along the lines the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) suggests here but it is not helpful, in my opinion, to single out and focus on the negotiations with India at this time.

I regret that the amendment is being offered. I wish it could be defeated but, like the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), I am realistic, too. I know that there is nothing we can do about the outcome.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, might I say to the Senator and to my colleagues here, that the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) brought up this amendment to the military procurement bill and I discussed it with him on the floor of the Senate.

Earlier, I had the privilege of discussing the negotiations relating to a settlement of the debts with India with Mr. Moynihan, our Ambassador to India. This settlement relates only to what we call soft currencies and not dollar loans. It relates to the Public Law 480 account. Also, Mr. Moynihan told us that the proposal for a settlement—I repeat just the proposal for a settlement—would be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because it is under Public Law 480. My understanding is if we want to, we can file, as we do under the reorganization plan, a motion of objection, and that will kill it if the motion carries; otherwise it goes through by consent. But what the Senator from Virginia is seeking is congressional action and congressional participation. He had the votes, and I thought, as I talked to him about it the other day, that this was an appropriate vehicle for this amendment to be on, even more so than in the military procurement bill.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would suggest that we have a voice vote on the amendment and by the time we come to conference, may I say to the Senator from Virginia, we will have had all of the administration's views by then, so that we can discuss it further with the Senator if there needs to be any modification.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). All time on the amendment has now been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, while Senators are waiting for the arrival of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) be recognized to call up an amendment at this time without prejudice to the rights of Mr. EAGLETON following disposition of the Brooke amendment.

Would the Senator from Massachusetts be agreeable to cutting the time on his amendment?

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, yes. I do not believe this amendment will take more than 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. To be equally divided, then?

Mr. BROOKE. Yes, equally divided.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I say that I want the Senator from Massachusetts to take most of the time because I so thoroughly am in sympathy with his amendment and I am sure that the Senate will be when it hears his explanation of it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could the Senator from Massachusetts give us some idea of what the amendment is about?

Mr. BROOKE. This is an amendment to provide \$1 million for the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Gabon for leprosy.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts be limited to 15 minutes, with the time to be equally divided and in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 539

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 539 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 24. There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for fiscal year 1974 \$1,000,000 to make grants, on such terms and conditions as he may specify, to the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Gabon.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed for myself, Senators HUMPHREY, JAVITS, McGEE, McGOVERN, MOSS, HATHAWAY, and TUNNEY would authorize to be appropriated to the President for fiscal year 1974, \$1 million to be used as a grant to the Albert Schweitzer Hospital, the money to aid in the construction of a leprosy rehabilitation wing for that facility.

The Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Lambarene, Gabon, was started by Dr. Schweitzer in 1913. Since its inception, over 150,000 patients have been treated there and its importance to the area is illustrated by the fact that in the mid-1960's one out of every three operations performed in Gabon was performed at the Schweitzer Hospital.

The Schweitzer Hospital has now grown to include over 70 buildings. However, it is not a hospital in the usual sense of the word—it is essentially a village where anyone in need is given shelter and medical care. It has always

been the policy of the Schweitzer Hospital to treat its patients in the context of their own culture.

Rather than frighten and estrange those already suffering from physical pain, the Schweitzer Hospital provides surroundings familiar to its patients. In addition, it encourages patients' families to stay at the hospital and help care for them—speeding their recovery and performing many of the tasks which would otherwise require additional hospital staff.

After Dr. Schweitzer's death in 1965, an International Committee for the Albert Schweitzer Hospital was formed to perpetuate his work. The committee has recently determined that there is a compelling need for a new Leprosy Rehabilitation Center at the hospital.

At the present time, leprosy is a substantial problem in Gabon and in neighboring areas of West Africa. In Gabon alone there are 20,000 known sufferers—many in terrible pain. Drugs now exist which make leprosy a controllable and treatable disease. While the Government of Gabon and its neighboring counterparts are trying to treat those who contract active leprosy, they cannot begin to treat or restrain the thousands who become crippled by this cruel disease. Therefore, there is an enormous, immediate need for expanded leprosy rehabilitation facilities in West Africa.

The Schweitzer Hospital has historically provided comprehensive treatment and assistance to those suffering from leprosy. In the 1940's, shortly after a major breakthrough in the effective treatment of leprosy, a complex called the Village of Light was developed within the Schweitzer Hospital. Here lepers and their families live during the course of treatment and rehabilitation which can take 2 years or more. Dr. Schweitzer used the moneys he won for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1952 to expand the village. It is now a facility where lepers can come, not to live out their lives as outcasts, but to be treated and taught so that they may return as fully functioning members of their society. There are now 120 patients and their families in the Village of Light and numerous other patients are treated in the hospital's clinic. Consistent with the rehabilitative goals of the Village of Light, its patients work there to the maximum extent possible. The lepers now raise almost enough fruit and vegetables to feed the entire hospital and many have been trained to overcome their disabilities and to work as secretaries and in similar capacities while at the hospital.

Given the great need, Lambarene is the obvious site for a new Leprosy Rehabilitation Center. The presence of the Schweitzer Hospital, the experience of its staff, and the confidence it has built among Africans from Gabon and elsewhere, make it uniquely equipped for this undertaking. The proposed New Leprosy Rehabilitation Center will initially include a surgical facility, radiology labs, a clinic, administrative offices, living units, and two 30-bed hospital wards. Two more hospi-

tal awards are ultimately expected to be added. The center's surgeons will employ the latest, highly skilled techniques of reconstructive surgery to rebuild deteriorating limbs and features. Trained therapists will help its patients to overcome their handicaps and to learn skills adapted to them. The new facility will permit the Schweitzer Hospital to better serve 1,500 to 2,000 patients per year.

The International Committee for the Albert Schweitzer Hospital is now trying to raise the \$6 million necessary to construct and operate the proposed new facility for 5 years. The international commitment to this project is reflected by the fact that the honorary chairmen of the committee now include President Nixon, Prime Minister Heath, President Pompidou, Chancellor Brandt, former Prime Minister Sato, Former Secretary General U Thant and Albert Bongo, President of Gabon.

Given the magnitude of the existing challenge, the Schweitzer Hospital is, for the first time in its 60 years history, seeking public as well as private contributions. The Schweitzer Hospital has always had widespread support in the United States. Over 10,000 Americans have contributed almost \$300,000 to the hospital since 1972. The committee is now seeking in the United States \$2 million in private contributions, in addition to the \$1 million appropriation which I propose today.

Such a grant from the U.S. Government will not only complement private contributions in this country but will parallel the efforts of other nations. The government of Gabon is contributing \$500,000 to the project and to date approximately \$300,000 has been raised privately in Holland and Switzerland. In addition, Japan and Germany are seriously considering contributions of \$1 million each and fund-raising efforts are underway in Great Britain, France, and other nations.

A grant of \$1 million to the Albert Schweitzer Hospital by the U.S. Government can have several significant immediate effects. Such a grant will permit the building of the surgical facility and the wards to support it. These facilities would be readily identifiable as an American contribution and would be the first portion of the rehabilitation center constructed. In addition, such a grant should catalyze the commitment of contributions now being contemplated by other nations.

The proposed Leprosy Rehabilitation Center will be the only hospital in Gabon giving specialized care to leprosy patients. In addition, it will provide its patients with education in health care and will train Africans to eventually assume the major share of the hospital operations. It will serve those now suffering in West Africa and will be a model for similar centers elsewhere.

We are in a period in which American foreign assistance has too often appeared to be unfortunately entangled with war, destruction, and death. At this time it is fitting and proper that our country take a prominent role in the realization of the proposed Leprosy Rehabilitation Center which will serve as a living me-

morial to Dr. Schweitzer's personal philosophy—"reverence for life."

I am sure the Members of the Senate recognize the humanitarian worth of this project and will vote accordingly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have material describing the proposed Leprosy Rehabilitation Center at the Schweitzer Hospital be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ALBERT SCHWEITZER HOSPITAL—THE CASE FOR SUPPORT

"I beg of you who have helped up to now to continue to aid it, to furnish the material funds for its existence. For it would be too bad for the population of this large region if the hospital which helps those who suffer (and their number is quite large) should no longer exist. It must be able to survive me . . . this worry obsesses me continually, this hope supports me."—Albert Schweitzer, June 24, 1964, Lambaréné, Africa.

SUMMARY

The Albert Schweitzer Hospital is recognized throughout the world as having made a unique contribution to the health of Gabonese and other West Africans; as a prototype for the creation of Schweitzer hospitals in Haiti, Peru, and Korea; and to the understanding of Schweitzer's philosophy, "reverence for life."

Begun in Lambaréné, Gabon, by Schweitzer in 1913, over 140,000 patients have been treated, 20,000 operations performed and thousands of lives saved. By the mid-1960s one out of three operations performed in the nation to Gabon was performed at the Schweitzer hospital—and the number is growing.

The most compelling need now is for a Leprosy Rehabilitation Center adjacent, and attached, to the Hospital to fight leprosy. Leprosy is endemic in Gabon and West Africa. There are 20,000 known sufferers—many in terrible pain. With new programs for leprosy patients—and the training of Africans to eventually assume the major share of hospital operations—the new facility will require \$2.2 million for construction and \$3.8 million to operate for five years. Half of this total of \$6,000,000 has been accepted by Europeans as their responsibility to raise. The remaining \$3,000,000 is sought in the U.S.A.

For the first year, the American objective is \$1,000,000. It is the intent of this statement to justify the need and to solicit the generous response of corporations and corporate foundations, general welfare and family foundations, religious and civic organizations and, of course, sympathetic individuals.

THE LEPROSY REHABILITATION CENTER

Nearly sixty years ago, Dr. Albert Schweitzer went into the African jungle and built a hospital at Lambaréné in what is today the Republic of Gabon. Although many of the facilities are now outdated, the AISL (Association Internationale de l'Hôpital Albert Schweitzer à Lambaréné) Hospital Committee has decided that the costs for construction of facilities for a completely new general hospital are prohibitive. There is, however, a less costly, but no less important need which can be fully met by the immediate construction and equipping of a Leprosy Rehabilitation Center adjacent to the present Hospital.

As previously stated, there are an estimated 20,000 leprosy-afflicted people in the Republic of Gabon and environs. The special government service dealing with the major endemic diseases is battling against leprosy in the villages of Gabon, trying to treat all those with active disease, but it cannot begin to tackle the thousands of patients who are already crippled in some way by less active,

or arrested, cases. It should be realized that leprosy is controllable and treatable and is held to be curable in many cases.

Unless a significant, immediate special effort is made, the backlog of preventable deformity will never be treated, and the crippled victim, the arrested patient, will continue to suffer needlessly till he dies.

Lambaréné is the obvious site for a Leprosy Rehabilitation Center for those who suffer from deformity or disability due to past leprosy. The presence of the Hospital for all these years, the experience of its staff, the confidence it has built among Africans from Gabon and elsewhere, all lend credibility to this undertaking.

The Center is planned so as to make available to the whole of Gabon—and beyond to all West Africa—the skills of the trained surgeon; the physiotherapist and occupational therapist; the makers of protective footwear and splints and artificial limbs.

For people throughout the world, Lambaréné has been long associated with general and tropical medicine as well as with the specific treatment of leprosy. And the name of Schweitzer, for them, epitomizes the compassion of a man for his less fortunate fellows. But today, with new medicines, and new surgical techniques at our disposal, together with recently acquired knowledge and changing social attitudes, simple caring is not alone enough. It must be accompanied by, and demonstrated by, competent medical and surgical skills.

Therefore a new Leprosy Rehabilitation Center will serve the thousands who contracted the disease before effective treatment became available, or whose treatment was for some reason inadequate or irregular.

There is no hospital in Gabon which specializes in taking complete care of leprosy patients. This does not mean medical care alone, but also physiotherapeutic and surgical treatment, as well as social services. A modern Leprosy Rehabilitation Center will change the focus of the Hospital. It will, in a certain measure, cease to be the general Hospital it is, since many diseases can be treated competently in the government hospitals which now exist. Lambaréné's principal mission will be the fight against leprosy. In addition to the emphasis on leprosy rehabilitation. The Hospital will include an orthopedic and traumatologic clinic to serve patients with accidents, congenital and acquired deformities and paralysis. It will, of course, continue to be open for all acutely threatened emergency patients.

The Rehabilitation Center is a project of the AISL (Association Internationale de l'Hôpital Albert Schweitzer à Lambaréné) and developed by the AISL Hospital Committee in Zurich (in cooperation with Dr. Peter Kessler of Munich, a medical doctor and hospital architect.)

In March 1972, the AISL agreed on a plan to build a center with 80 beds for leprosy rehabilitation, orthopedic-traumatology and general surgery. The Center can be subsequently expanded to 120 beds, which will then correspond to requirements set by the Gabonese government.

The new buildings will be integrated into existing structures so that the historical character of the Hospital built by Dr. Schweitzer remains intact. The existing Hospital plant will continue to function until the new buildings are ready. Afterwards the old Hospital will be carefully restored and lodgings will be installed for chronic care patients and their families, and hospital personnel.

Site

The hill of Atadie has been chosen for the new hospital plant, because the buildings can be integrated naturally into its surroundings; the circulation of fresh air is extremely good; and there is room for expansion. The main entrance of the new hospital will be reached directly from the principal traffic area—in

this instance the wharf at Atadie (near the existing children's hospital and the dental clinic). It will become the center of the entire complex. On one side is a polyclinic where the patients arrive. On the other side are administrative offices. A covered road connects all entrances and waiting rooms of the hospital buildings. The operating area (which includes X-ray and clinical laboratories) is centrally located. The wards, with 30 beds each, are on a higher level. Extensions to the wards are possible by lengthening the above units or by adding new buildings on the adjoining hillside.

Buildings for the medical staff are situated near the new hospital area, and three additional buildings are planned. All the new dwellings will have separate entrances and individual cooking facilities, as well as sufficient living space.

The construction of the new hospital facilities and living quarters will be done as economically as possible, utilizing indigenous labor and materials.

Equipment

All medical equipment will be modern and designed to meet the needs of routine surgery, rehabilitation surgery, traumatology, orthopedics, urology, otolaryngology, ophthalmology and internal medicine. There will be a complete diagnostic laboratory (including bacteriology and serology), an X-ray diagnostic center and E.K.G. facilities.

Water

All water will be taken from the nearby Ogowe River for the old and for the new Hospitals. This water will be purified and filtered in a central reservoir. The waste water will be purified and recirculated back to the river. Also, drainage systems will protect the whole complex during the rainy season. Diesel powered generators will provide all the necessary electricity.

Building costs

The complete cost of the Leprosy Rehabilitation Center is based on a detailed estimate as of January, 1972. This cost projection was made by a general contractor in Gabon in cooperation with architectural firm in Switzerland and a medical firm in Germany.

Costs include the first stage of the new Hospital in Atadie as well as the quarters for the medical-administrative staff and other personnel.

Electrical and water systems will be centralized to serve both the old and the new Hospital. The costs for the renovation of the existing Hospital are not included, because this work will be carried out by hospital workers. Substantial economies will be possible because much of the labor will be by patients' families. The Republic of Gabon has stated that no customs will have to be paid for materials imported for the Hospital. However, the inflationary spiral is a fact of life in Gabon, as elsewhere, and a yearly cost rise of 8-12% is anticipated.

The following comprises the complete costs for the new Hospital. Each ward includes the costs for construction, installations, medical equipment and a part of costs for the work in the surrounding area (including electrical systems, water, drainage, and roads), as well as construction fees and contingencies.

Administration/dining room,	
kitchen, laundry	\$515,060
Polyclinic/physiotherapy	197,343
Surgery/X-ray/laboratory	425,667
Ward (30 beds)	259,170
Ward (27 beds)	260,035
Medical-administrative staff	
housing	120,954
Personnel: (Nurses, etc.) 16 living units	289,486
Total	2,077,615

Price as of January 1972, excluding price increases up to January 1973 (approx. 10%) -----

207,762

A NEW LAMBARÉNE

Walter Munz, M.D., who was designated by Dr. Schweitzer in his will to assume the responsibility for the medical supervision of the Hospital, has written: "Dr. Schweitzer never considered his hospital as the best he could accomplish, and up to the end of his life he worked for its further development. That the stream of patients from all parts of the area did not diminish after his death is a testimony to the necessity of our continuing his efforts. In order to retain its medical efficiency and humanitarian significance Lambaréné must be adapted to the new requirements of this area of West Africa. It need not be luxurious but it must be modern and capable of helping the Africans solve those problems which they cannot as yet cope with alone. A greater participation by the Gabonese in the operation of the Hospital is envisaged so as to prepare them to take over eventually.

After Dr. Schweitzer's death his colleagues in Lambaréné tried, together with friends in Europe and the United States, to continue the Hospital. Several services were extended and improved. In cooperation with the Gabonese Government, which has always demonstrated a traditional friendship for the Hospital, a new project for the future of Lambaréné has been worked out. Although private, this Hospital will take an important place within the concept of Gabon's National Health Service and remain true to the spirit of Dr. Schweitzer.

As a long time medical colleague of Dr. Schweitzer, I recommend the project to everybody's generous support.

GIFT OPPORTUNITIES

Gifts commensurate with the \$3,000,000¹ American goal are eagerly sought. Donors may wish to subscribe unrestricted gifts. Such benefactions will be allocated at the discretion of the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship's Board of Trustees to the construction fund, or the operating fund, as required.

Contributors may also wish to consider these commemorative opportunities:

Administration building	\$750,000
Radiology laboratory	500,000
1 of 2 30-bed wards	250,000
Polyclinic and physiotherapy	200,000
X-ray equipment	150,000
Administration dining room	100,000
Administration kitchen	75,000
Surgical area	50,000
Each of 3 living units for couples	30,000
Diagnostic laboratory	25,000
Orthopedics/traumatology	20,000
Each of 16 family living units	15,000
60 hospital beds	10,000
Specific items of equipment	
from \$500 to 10,000	

Bequests and legacies are encouraged as are gifts of stocks and bonds. Pledges—for terms not exceeding three tax years—are particularly welcome. All contributions, stock assignments, etc. are payable to, or should be recorded in, the name of the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship. All contributions from individuals and corporations are fully tax deductible in the manner and to the extent provided by law.

Contributions should be mailed or delivered to the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship, 866 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017 (212-752-1760).

¹\$1.1 million for construction; \$1.9 million for five years' operation.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER HOSPITAL, LAMBARÉNE, GABON, REHABILITATION CENTER

[Summary of costs as of Jan. 1, 1972]

	Buildings (1)	Installations (2)	Interior equipment (3)	Total by building (4-3)	Exterior construction (4)	Contractor and architectural fees (5)	Total (6)
A. Hospital:							
1. Administration.....	\$136,895	\$20,960	\$226,126	\$383,981	\$19,910	\$39,169	\$515,060
2. Polyclinic/physiotherapy.....	85,626	15,720	17,554	118,900	63,509	14,934	197,343
3. Radiology laboratories.....	129,890	36,680	134,930	301,500	91,910	32,357	425,567
4. Hospital wards (30 beds).....	109,123	17,292	31,178	157,593	81,875	19,702	259,170
5. Hospital wards (27 beds).....	109,123	21,222	28,034	158,379	81,875	19,781	260,035
Total.....	570,457	111,874	437,822	1,120,153	411,079	125,943	1,657,175
B. Personnel:							
6. 3 buildings (2 families each).....	79,140	17,292	3,537	99,969	11,790	9,195	120,954
C. Medical staff:							
7. 16 living units (1 family each).....	215,040	33,536	7,968	256,544	20,174	22,768	299,486
Total A, B, and C.....	864,637	162,702	449,327	1,476,666	443,043	157,906	2,077,615

Note: Not included—estimated increase in costs (10 percent) as of Jan. 1, 1973: \$207,752.

A PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE ALBERT
SCHWEITZER HOSPITAL

(By Rhena Schweitzer Miller)

When my father, Albert Schweitzer, was twenty-one years old, he decided that up to his thirtieth year he would live for his studies and his interests in philosophy, in theology, and music, but after that he would do something to relieve the suffering in the world. In the fall of 1904 he found on his desk in Strasbourg an appeal from the Paris Missionary Society for help in their Mission in Gabon where the native population was in desperate need. His search was over. He decided to study medicine because, as he said, "I wanted to be a doctor that I might be able to work without having to talk. For years I had been giving myself out in words . . . But in this new form of activity I could not represent to myself as talking about the religion of love, but only as an actual putting it into practice."

On Good Friday, in 1913, my father and mother were ready to set out for the great adventure of their lives. In Andende, the mission station of the Paris Missionary Society, my father performed his first operations in an old chicken-coop as the patients arrived before he even had time to put up the necessary buildings for them.

The First World War interrupted his work, and when he had to return to Europe in 1917 he left a hospital of fifty beds. Because of ill health and financial difficulties, it was 1924 before he could return to Andende to resume his work.

In 1925, the country suffered a severe famine and an epidemic of dysentery. My father realized that his hospital, being limited in space and badly overcrowded, was not in a position to cope with major health problems. He decided to move it up the river to an excellent location, with ample space for expansion. There he began building a new hospital—the hospital which exists today. For more than forty years it has continuously grown and now comprises over seventy buildings. It really is not a hospital in the usual sense of the word, but a village where everyone in need is given shelter and medical care—where no one has ever been turned away.

A major principle of my father in relation to the hospital's patients was to provide living conditions to which they were accustomed and to interfere as little as possible with their private lives. They do not come to the hospital alone. They are accompanied by one or more members of their family who stay with them during the treatment period in order to look after their personal needs, and so give them a feeling of security. The patients come mostly from the interior of the country, sometimes from far away where living conditions are still very primitive. We do not force upon them a foreign standard of living.

It would make them feel uncomfortable and eventually drive them away, which would mean an interruption of treatment and a waste of time and money. We concentrate all of our efforts and financial resources on giving them the best medical treatment possible. In addition, we have now begun to give them some education in health care.

Each year we treat about 6,000 new patients. Besides the 450 to 500 hospitalized patients and the 120 patients in the Village of Light, we also treat a large number of people from the surrounding villages in our out-patient clinic.

Up to the end of his life, my father was a father to all those who lived in the hospital community—black and white people, patients and staff members. Even though he delegated most of the medical work to his doctors, he spent several hours each day in the main building of the hospital, writing out orders for drugs and equipment, attending to his correspondence, and keeping himself informed about all that was going on. The great concern of his last years was to construct enough buildings to house the ever-increasing number of patients, so that we would be able to continue to accept all those who came to seek help. When the good doctor left us in September 1965, it was an irreplaceable loss to us all and to the entire world. The Africans said, "The sun has left us," and according to their tribal customs, they paid tribute to his memory in dances and songs as fervently as they would have for one of their own. We are all grateful that he rests among us in the African earth and in his hospital. According to the Africans, he has thus not completely left us, and we who continue to work there share this feeling. Despite our deep grief, there was no interruption in the work of the hospital, and there were no troubles, as many people had predicted. The Africans had but one fear—that we would leave and abandon them. They seemed much relieved when we assured them that this was not the case.

The then President of Gabon, His Excellency Monsieur M'ba, whom we went to see shortly after the death of my father, spoke with deep emotion of the passing of his old friend and the loss his country had suffered. He praised my father's selfless work and the continuous help he had given to the population of the Lambaréné area through all those long years. He encouraged us to continue the work of my father in his spirit and promised us his personal help, assuring us of his good will and expressing but one wish—that we would not tear down the buildings that my father had put up but preserve the hospital as he had built it. He said, "Your father understood my people and knew their needs." President Albert Bongo who succeeded M'ba has been equally enthusiastic in his support of the hospital and gladly accepted the role of Interna-

tional Honorary Chairman of the Schweitzer Hospital Committee.

My father left us a heritage full of responsibilities. We are holding faithfully to the principles on which he founded his hospital and which have proved their value through all the years. The patients will continue to come with their families and to live in our hospital as in their villages. We also will continue to require their contribution in the form of work, and will carry on the construction and maintenance work with their help.

Lambaréné will remain an African village, but we wish to make it a village such as it ought to become. We have extended electrification from the working areas of the hospital where we have had electricity for many years, to the patients' wards and to our living quarters. We have improved sanitary conditions by better sewerage and garbage disposal and an adequate supply of pure water to the entire hospital, including the Village of Light.

As we educate our patients, we also wish to increase the number of African assistants and to give them more training in view of the greater responsibilities they will assume in the future. Our laboratory is the first of our services which functions entirely with African personnel, and it functions well. Later, we must face the problem of modern buildings for surgery, laboratories, and X-ray facilities. The President of Gabon does not wish us to demolish the houses which my father has built. How deeply grateful we are for this wish, for it would have torn our hearts and in the end changed the whole character of the hospital.

We have acquired Atadie, an adjoining property which was an old timber-cutting post, now abandoned. On this land we will build our Rehabilitation Center.

The hospital thus far has been supported solely by voluntary contributions. There has been no government or any other official support, but people all over the world have been contributing to this work and continue to do so. In many countries committees have been formed to arouse and sustain interest in the work of my father, as well as to administer and channel the donations. After the death of my father, these committees united with a central international committee, the Association Internationale de l'Hôpital Albert Schweitzer à Lambaréné, with headquarters in Strasbourg, Alsace, France. In this international organization all the different countries are represented, and it is this new organization which now carries the responsibility for the support of the hospital and the continuation of the work of my father. Many problems will have to be solved, many important decisions be taken. Money will be needed. The responsibility is enormous. But, above all, it is important that the spirit of my father continues to direct us in our work—

the spirit of selfless dedication to all those who are in need, the spirit of Reverence for Life in all its forms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, although I have never been enthusiastic about Congress undertaking to determine how each dollar of an aid appropriation shall be spent, however, since we have endorsed so many hospitals and schools scattered around the world, it seems only fitting now that we should accept the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, which would provide a hospital in an area where we have done very little and where such medical services are badly needed. Therefore, I support the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have the words of the distinguished senior member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the dean of the Senate, and to have his support for this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. This part of Africa particularly is a part of the world for which, with the exception of the Peace Corps, we have done very little. I know the African countries are looking more and more to us for cooperation than they have in the past, because Western Europe apparently is not giving them all they really need.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel that this is a very worthy amendment, and it is constructive in its purpose. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Vermont that this part of Africa has had very little attention.

This is a humanitarian proposal and can be a tremendous help to people who suffer from the dread disease of leprosy. I am privileged—as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, because he invited me—to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

If the Senator from Massachusetts is prepared to do so, we will yield back our time and get to a voice vote in this matter.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to have the distinguished floor manager of the bill as the principal cosponsor of this amendment. He has long been known for his humanitarian support, and I am very pleased that he will accept the amendment, so that we can get on with a voice vote. Therefore, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for the purpose of calling up an amendment on which there is a limitation of 30 minutes, 15 minutes to each side.

Who yield time?

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my assistant, Mr. Brian Atwood, have the privilege of the floor during the pendency of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 579

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 579.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, strike out lines 10 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of 1961 is amended to read as follows: '(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 not to exceed \$23,500,000, to provide assistance authorized by this part only for disaster relief purposes, in accordance with the provisions applicable to the furnishing of such assistance.'"

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment on line 6 to strike the word "only" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "primarily."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the growing disenchantment of the American people with foreign aid is not a reflection of a lack of generosity. To the contrary, we are the most generous of nations. One measure of our generosity is illustrated by the overwhelming support Americans always give to Government efforts to assist those suffering from natural or man-made catastrophes.

The list in recent years is a long one: The civil strife in Nigeria; the earthquakes in Peru, Nicaragua, and Mexico; the floods in Bangladesh; the drought in West Africa. And in every case American disaster relief, both private and public, has been instrumental in helping to alleviate the pain and suffering of those who have experienced tragedy.

No sections of the bill before us today better capture the American spirit of generosity than those providing for disaster relief. This is the only form of foreign aid that is not intended to show tangible political benefit. And it continues to receive the unqualified support of the American people.

This year's bill contains a number of special categories to cover known disaster areas such as West Africa and Indochina. The major portion of American relief assistance for unforeseen catastrophes is, however, authorized by section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the section entitled "Contingency Fund."

Describing this fund in its "Program Presentation to Congress" booklet, the Agency for International Development said the following:

The need to have funds available is illustrated by such recent emergencies as relief for the victims of the Nicaragua earthquake and aid for refugees in southern Sudan. In such circumstances, it is imperative that the United States be able to respond quickly and effectively and, in an international context, to encourage positive action on the part of other donors.

No one would argue with the principle espoused in this statement. It is obvious that we must have the flexibility to move quickly to provide relief. Even political differences should not interfere with the

availability of this fund when other nations experience disaster.

But the contingency fund is not reserved primarily for disaster relief, as I believe it should be. The AID booklet also states that the fund may be used "for situations involving the security interests of the United States."

Frankly, that statement greatly concerns me. It should not be necessary to run through the litany of bad experiences we have had in recent years over the varied interpretations of America's "security interests." If we have learned anything from those experiences, it is that the collective judgment of both Congress and the President best serves to define what is in the national interest.

As we seek, therefore, to reassert congressional control over the processes of government, an open-ended "slush fund" seems a vastly inappropriate part of our foreign aid program. The amendment I propose today seeks to correct that incongruous situation.

During the fiscal year 1973, only one-half of the total expenditures from the contingency fund were spent on disaster relief. Other grants—totaling \$12,360,000—were made to the World Health Organization for a plan to develop a global strategy against cholera, to finance a livestock research and development project in the Bahamas, and to pay the U.S. share of contributions to the International Commission for Control and Supervision in Vietnam.

It is clear from the nature of these items that, outside the disaster relief category, many of the grants made with section 451 money were made in areas which should have been anticipated in the annual budget request. Others, such as our contribution to the International Commission established by the Paris Peace Agreement, should have been of sufficient import to warrant submission of a request to Congress for funding by special supplemental legislation. And still other grants could have clearly awaited congressional approval during routine consideration of the following-year aid bill.

The following list of nonurgent items taken from past AID summaries of contingency fund obligations indicates that tighter congressional control over this fund is badly needed:

In fiscal year 1972 a cash grant of \$9.5 million was given to Malta to "support the economic and political stability of the Government of Malta in order to facilitate continuation of important strategic arrangements with that country."

Also in fiscal 1972 a cash grant of \$15 million was given to the Jordan Government to help that Government "maintain its political stability."

In fiscal 1971, \$3.7 million was provided to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "to pay a claim to a private U.S. contractor arising out of an AID construction project for which the Corps of Engineers was the implementing agent for AID."

In fiscal year 1970, a supporting assistance grant of \$378,000 was made for the public safety program for Guatemala, "to assist Guatemalan police in their efforts against an upsurge in urban terrorism."

October 2, 1973

In fiscal 1970, a grant of \$1.5 million was made to the American University of Beirut "to cover additional construction costs for the university's medical center."

Also in fiscal 1970, \$1 million was transferred to the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for a grant "to assist the Government of Mexico in its program to eradicate opium, poppy, and marihuana plants and to control the traffic of narcotics in the United States."

I wish to make it clear that some of these grants have considerable merit in their own right. Most would be supported by Congress if we were given the opportunity.

Last year, for example, the administration wanted to demonstrate the commitment of the United States to the future success of the newly independent nation of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. The contingency fund was used to provide a \$10 million grant for a livestock project.

But a contingency fund created primarily as a means of responding to natural disasters should not be used to express a commitment of the United States no matter how worthy the policy considerations might appear. What might seem to be a worthy use of the contingency fund today could too easily be an abuse tomorrow.

My purpose in introducing this amendment is to protect our ability to respond adequately and expeditiously to disasters. Misuse of this fund in a manner which seems to circumvent the legislative process can only detract from its principal purpose—that of enabling America to move quickly in relief of those suffering the consequences of catastrophe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of those items that fall under the disaster relief category and

a summary of the uses of the contingency fund over the past 5 years be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DISASTER RELIEF

Following is a list of natural and man-made disasters for which relief has been provided by the United States Government through the Agency for International Development contingency fund:

Volcanic disturbances, earthquake, drought, cyclone, floods, civil strife, displaced persons (refugees), fire, famine, disease, explosion.

AID also stockpiles disaster relief equipment in certain areas of the world so that it will be immediately available in case of emergency. This stockpiled equipment is paid for through the contingency fund appropriation.

CONTINGENCY FUND USES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year				
	1966	1970	1971	1972	1973
Disaster and refugee relief and reconstruction.....	4,000	24,000	24,542	3,471	14,407
Security assistance.....	3,000	1,000	24,500	2,018	
Development assistance.....	5,000		2,000	10,000	
Other.....		3,000	4,700	100	35
Total.....	13,000	28,000	29,242	30,071	26,460

1 Figures rounded to millions.

Foreign Assistance Act contingency fund program as of June 30, 1973

(Narrative explanation of net changes in program during fourth quarter, fiscal year 1973)

ASIA

Khmer Republic..... —\$150,000
Grants totaling \$150,000 pre-

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

CONTINGENCY FUND PROGRAM AND OBLIGATIONS, 4TH QUARTER ENDING JUNE 30, 1973

[In thousands of dollars]

	Program as of Mar. 31, 1973	Net change in 4th quarter	Program as of June 30, 1973	Obligations as of June 30, 1973		Program as of Mar. 31, 1973	Net change in 4th quarter	Program as of June 30, 1973	Obligations as of June 30, 1973
Asia: Khmer Republic Refugee Relief.....	150	150	0	0	Sahelian drought relief.....		-(4,697)	(4,697)	(4,697)
Interregional:					Cyclone (Fiji).....	(762)		(762)	(762)
WHO grant for cholera emergency planning.....	35		35	35	Floods.....	(150)	-(200)	(350)	(350)
Bahamas livestock R. & D. project.....	10,000		10,000	10,000	Civil strife.....	(243)	-(100)	(343)	(343)
U.S. contribution to the international Commission for Control and Supervision, Vietnam.....		+2,013	2,018	2,018	Displaced persons.....	(25)		(25)	(25)
Disaster relief.....	11,674	+2,733	14,407	14,407	Fire.....	(34)	+(9)	(43)	(43)
Volcanic disturbances (Iceland).....	(85)	(-5)	(80)	(80)	Drought.....		+(25)	(25)	(25)
Nicaragua earthquake.....	(10,000)	(-2,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	Famine.....		+(14)	(14)	(14)
					Earthquake.....		+(25)	(25)	(25)
					Miscellaneous.....	(4)	+(39)	(43)	(43)
					Unobligated reserve.....	(371)	-(371)		
					Total contingency fund, AID.....	21,859	+4,601	26,460	26,460
					Transfer to Department of State for Sudan Refugee Relief.....	2,500	-2,500	0	0
					Total contingency fund uses.....	24,359	+2,101	26,460	26,460

Foreign Assistance Act contingency fund—fiscal year 1973 approved uses of the contingency funds as of June 15, 1973

U.S. share of contributions to the International Commission for Control and Supervision (ICCS), Vietnam..... \$2,018,000
Grant to WHO for cholera emergency planning..... 35,000

This grant was made to WHO as a result of AID's effort to stimulate WHO to develop a global strategy to eliminate emer-

gency conditions caused by the seventh pandemic of cholera. The grant is to augment WHO staff resources for emergency planning.

Bahama livestock research and development project.....\$10,000,000

This is a grant for a two part livestock project. Approximately \$4 million will be for research, studies training, and technical assistance to be done by Penn State, the Western Institute of Technology, and Texas State Tech.

viously authorized for refugee relief were changed to supporting assistance funding.

INTERREGIONAL

International Commission for Control and Supervision—Vietnam..... +\$2,018,000

Grants totaling \$2,018,000 were made to meet the U.S. assessment for providing financial support for the ICCS in Vietnam.

Disaster relief grants..... 2,733,000

Of the \$10,300,000 previously obligated for the relief effort resulting from the Nicaragua earthquake only \$8,000,000 was ultimately needed and \$2,000,000 was deobligated. A total of \$4,697,000 was provided to the nations of the Sahelian area in Africa as relief from the catastrophic drought in that area. The net changes in funds programmed for disaster relief in the 4th quarter are:

Nicaragua: earthquake..... —2,000,000
Sahelian drought relief..... 4,697,000
Iceland: Volcanic disturbances..... —5,000
Tunisia: Floods..... 150,000
Indonesia: Famine..... 14,000
Algeria: Floods..... 25,000
Costa Rica: Earthquake..... 25,000
Burundi: Civil strife..... 100,000
Panama: Fire..... 9,000
Honduras: Drought..... 25,000
Guatemala: Floods..... 25,000
Guam disaster stockpile purchases..... 39,000
Unobligated reserve..... —371,000
Total..... 2,733,000

Statement Department..... —2,500,000

A transfer of \$2,500,000 originally made from the Contingency Fund to the Office of Refugee and Migration Affairs was changed to development loans during the 4th quarter.

Approximately \$6 million will go for 16 pilot farms, an ag. experiment station, and perhaps some ag. credit for new livestock growers.

Disaster relief.....\$12,668,000
Earthquake..... 8,025,000
Drought..... 2,912,000
Cyclone..... 762,000
Floods..... 325,000
Volcanic disturbance..... 85,000

October 2, 1973

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600170002-0

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 18375

Civil strife.....	\$50,000
Fire.....	43,000
Stockpile transfer.....	39,000
Displaced persons.....	25,000
Famine.....	13,000
Miscellaneous.....	4,000
Unobligated reserve.....	385,000

Total contingency fund..... 24,721,000

Contingency fund uses, fiscal year 1972

DISASTER AND REFUGEE RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION

Interregional disaster relief:	
Floods.....	\$578,000
Earthquakes.....	262,000
War displaced persons.....	250,000
Civil strife.....	172,000
Storms.....	99,000
Volcano threat.....	92,000
Stockpile increases.....	60,000
Disease.....	46,000
Drought.....	25,000
Explosion.....	25,000
Miscellaneous.....	12,000

Subtotal..... 1,621,000

Eastern European refuge assistance..... 1,850,000

Pursuant to Section 2(C) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, the President authorized a transfer of \$1,850,000 to the Department of State to meet unanticipated urgent needs in connection with assistance to refugees from Eastern European countries.

Subtotal..... 3,471,000

SECURITY ASSISTANCE

Jordan..... 15,000,000

A cash grant was made to supplement the \$30 million previously provided out of supporting assistance. Its purposes was to help the Jordanian Government maintain its political stability which is an essential element in the search for a just and lasting resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Malta..... 9,500,000

A cash grant was made in two tranches to support the economic and political stability of the Government of Malta and facilitate the continuation of important strategic arrangements with that country.

Subtotal..... 24,500,000

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Bolivia..... 2,000,000

A cash grant was made to the Government of Bolivia to fund an emergency public investment program required to relieve severe unemployment problems and resume the Bolivian development effort.

OTHER

U.N. Conference on the Human Environment..... 100,000

A contribution was made to the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment to support preparatory work with the developing countries to strengthen their participation in the Conference.

Total FY 1972..... 30,071,000

Contingency fund uses, fiscal year 1971

DISASTER AND REFUGEE RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION

Interregional disaster relief:	
Floods.....	\$1,118,000
Earthquakes.....	322,000
Cholera.....	310,000
Typhoons.....	248,000
World Health Organization.....	200,000
Miscellaneous.....	96,000

Total..... 2,294,000

Philippines: Typhoon damage school reconstruction..... 1,500,000

As part of the program of relief following typhoons Joan, Kate, and Patsy, a supporting assistance grant of \$1.5 million was made to the Philippines to cover the repair and reconstruction of typhoon damaged schools.

Jordan: Civil strife..... 4,250,000

\$4,250,000 was provided to Jordan for emergency relief and rehabilitation following civil disturbances caused by Palestinian commandoes.

East Pakistan: Civil strife..... 1,000,000

\$1,000,000 was provided to East Pakistan victims of the civil strife there.

East Pakistan: Cyclone..... 7,500,000

\$7,500,000 was provided to East Pakistan for relief of victims of the cyclone and tidal bore.

U.N. High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR): Refugee relief..... 5,000,000

\$5,000,000 was provided to UNHCR for care of East Pakistani refugees in India.

Transfer to Department of State..... 3,000,000

In accordance with the Presidential determinations, pursuant to section 2(C) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act, \$10,000,000 of FAA funds were transferred to the Department of State in two tranches in order to meet unexpected urgent refugee and migration needs in connection with assistance to refugees in East Pakistan. Of this total, \$3,000,000 were from the contingency fund.

Subtotal..... 24,544,000

Minus refunded overcharges..... 2,000

Subtotal..... 24,542,000

OTHER

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)..... 1,000,000

\$1,000,000 was provided to the ICRC to relieve the financial emergency resulting from the committee's increased activities in the areas of humanitarian and disaster relief.

Payments to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers..... 3,700,000

\$3,700,000 was provided the Corps of Engineers to pay a claim to a private U.S. contractor arising out of an AID construction project for which the Corps of Engineers was the implementing agent for AID.

Subtotal..... 4,700,000

Total..... 29,242,000

Contingency fund uses, fiscal year 1970¹

DISASTER AND REFUGEE RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION

Peru: Earthquake.....	\$10,600,000
Peru for earthquake relief and rehabilitation.....	
Nigeria: Civil strife.....	2,000,000
\$2,000,000 was provided to Nigeria for international relief efforts.....	
Czechoslovakia, others: Refugees.....	5,800,000
\$5,800,000 was provided for relief of Czechoslovakian and other refugees.....	
Tunisia: Floods.....	2,000,000
\$2,000,000 was provided to Tunisia for relief of flood damage and reconstruction.....	

Subtotal..... 20,400,000

OTHER

Mexico: Narcotics control..... 1,000,000

\$1,000,000 was provided to Mexico to assist in narcotics control.

Total..... 21,400,000

¹ Does not include all uses since not enough data was available.

Contingency fund uses, fiscal year 1969¹

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Laos: Dam..... \$2,700,000

\$2,700,000 was provided for the U.S. share of a shortfall in funding of the multilateral Nam Ngum dam project in Laos.

¹ Does not include all uses since not enough data was available.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri has pointed out something that I think was needed in reference to what we call the contingency fund. The amount in this bill for the contingency fund is \$23.5 million. Actually, in the past I think we have had some misuse of the contingency fund in terms of it not being used for emergencies. The whole purpose of the contingency fund was to meet emergencies.

These funds have been spent, for example, for a Bahama livestock research and development project, last year in the amount of \$10 million. That, I think, should have been a development loan or grant rather than taken from the contingency fund.

The Senator has emphasized that the contingency fund should be primarily for disaster purposes, but I think that he would also allow what might be a necessity, such as the grant to WHO last year to work on cholera emergency planning when there was a fear of cholera and no funds were in the regular categories. A modest amount of \$35,000 was taken to be used for that particular purpose.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. EAGLETON. Something related to an imminent cholera epidemic such as

the WHO grant comes into the disaster category and would be permissible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the information in the committee report related to the use of the contingency fund in fiscal year 1973 so that we can see what has happened in the past.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Assistance Act contingency fund—fiscal year 1973 approved use of the contingency fund as of June 15, 1973

	Thousands
U.S. share of contributions to the international commission for control and supervision (ICCS)—Vietnam	\$2,018
Grant to WHO for cholera emergency planning	35
This grant was made to WHO as a result of A.I.D.'s effort to stimulate WHO to develop a global strategy to eliminate emergency conditions caused by the seventh pandemic of cholera. The grant is to augment WHO staff resources for emergency planning.	
Behama livestock research and development project	10,000
This is a grant for a two part livestock project. Approximately \$4 million will be for research, studies training and technical assistance to be done by Pennsylvania State, the Western Institute of Technology, and Texas State Tech. Approximately \$6 million will go for 16 pilot farms, an ag. experiment station, and perhaps some ag. credit for new livestock growers.	
Disaster relief	12,663
Earthquake	8,025
Drought	2,812
Cyclone	762
Floods	325
Volcanic Disturbance	85
Civil Strife	50
Fire	43
Stockpile Transfer	39
Displaced persons	25
Famine	13
Miscellaneous	4
Unobligated Reserve	385
Total Contingency Fund	24,721

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am more than happy to associate myself with the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I have discussed this matter with the ranking minority member, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Aiken), and we are suggesting that the amendment be agreed. I hope we can yield back our time and have a voice vote.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. EAGLETON. As a part of the legislative history of this amendment, which now reads "primarily" in lieu of "only," can I be assured by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that next year when this bill is working its way through the legislative process, that with his usual diligent attention the Senator will focus on this fund to make sure the expenditures were primarily for disaster or crisis-related situations? I

want to be absolutely sure that this fund is not siphoned off for items that could have been provided for in other portions of the AID bill—that the money will be used for unforeseen catastrophes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly. I hope the administrator of this program, when he uses any contingency fund assets, will report it immediately to the appropriate committees of Congress so that we have an idea what is going on and so we will know this fund is not used for anything other than emergencies. We have funds for development in several categories in this bill, with funding provided in the contingency fund for the kinds of things that are unpredictable, that come up and have to be handled promptly by the Secretary of State or the AID administrator.

Mr. EAGLETON. And of a crisis, disaster, or emergency-type situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. Mr. President, this time will be on the bill.

Will the Senator yield first to let me call up an amendment out of order?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment No. 563 out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will read the amendment.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read amendment No. 563 offered by Mr. HUMPHREY for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. DOLE.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the Record without its being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 563 is as follows:

Add the following new section to the end of the bill:

(a) It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should provide full participation in efforts to alleviate current and future food shortages which threaten the world.

(b) The President shall take immediate steps to initiate a high level commission to study and report on the world food situation through 1985 in consultation with relevant international agencies where possible and appropriate. This report should include estimates of world production and utilization, barriers to increase world productivity, the adequacy of transportation and distribution facilities, the known or anticipated world availability of agricultural inputs such as fertilizer, the impact of energy shortages on agricultural production, future sources of protein including sources from the seas, pro-

jections of humanitarian food assistance requirements, and the role of national trade policies in facilitating and encouraging the productive capacities of world agriculture.

(c) To provide a minimum level of security for the peoples of the world from suffering hunger and malnutrition the President shall cooperate with the appropriate international agencies such as the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations to establish an international system of strategic food reserves. Such a system of world food reserves should provide for an equitable distribution of the direct and indirect costs between producer and consumer nations.

(d) To bring appropriate attention to the current and potential threat to world security and social welfare the President shall instruct the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations to issue a formal request before the member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to explore means for assuring equitable access by all nations of the world to national markets and basic resources such as mineral and agricultural supplies.

(e) The President shall submit a report to the Congress no later than December 31, 1973, concerning the progress made in implementing the provisions of this section and should forward to the Congress by June 30, 1974, any recommendations he deems advisable for legislation required for United States participation in an international food reserve.

(f) To provide the Secretary of Agriculture the flexibility with which to respond to such emergencies Public Law 480 is amended as follows: The last sentence of section 401 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by striking the period and inserting a comma and the following: "unless the Secretary determines that some part of the exportable supply should be used to carry out the national interest and humanitarian objectives of this Act."

(g) In making any assessment which would affect or relate to the level of domestic production the Secretary of Agriculture should include in his estimated overall utilization the expected demands for humanitarian food assistance through such programs as Public Law 480.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I say I have cleared this amendment with the minority side, and there is no objection on that side.

Now I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota a question I note on page 11 of the bill there is provided \$900,000 each year for 2 years to the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance, Inc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. What in the world is that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a nongovernmental organization working in the field of Latin American economic development.

The committee report notes that—

This organization has done an effective job over the last several years in developing cooperative arrangements between our states, and cities and countries and cities in Latin America.

It is a kind of people-to-people program. There are cities, in the Senator's State and my State, for example, that have relations with cities in Argentina, Brazil, or Venezuela, for example.

The committee has given this program support over the years. It is something that has proven itself to be very valuable. By the way, it proves itself to be valuable even in economic terms, where communities have been able to induce investment from Latin America here and to find investment opportunities there.

It is not done by the Government, may I say; it is done by the local communities, the State of Virginia, the State of Minnesota, the city of Richmond, the city of St. Paul, all working with their Latin American counterparts in sister cities and provinces and so on.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. But the Federal money goes to this organization?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Could I ask another question? Under the heading "International Organizations and Programs" I note \$120 million is involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Which organizations are those?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Those are primarily U.N. organizations. We will give the Senator the complete listing of them. The listing is on page 22 of the committee report, and includes the U.N. development program, the U.N. children's fund, food and agricultural program, the World Health Organization, the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service. Those are some of the multilateral organizations that we aid. They are contributed to also by other countries.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment relates to the President's taking immediate steps to initiate a high-level commission to study and report on the world food situation through 1985 in consultation with relevant international agencies where possible and appropriate. However, it would relate not only to international agencies, but to other countries, both importing and exporting countries. The report would include estimates of world production and utilization, barriers to increase world productivity, and the adequacy of transportation and distribution facilities.

The purpose here is to get our Nation involved more directly with the international food program so that we do not have the burden of food relief strictly on our own shoulders. We need a much better understanding of what the crop reports are, what world production may be, and what world demands may be.

Therefore, we are asking the President to submit a report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1973, concerning the progress made in implementing the provisions of this section, and to forward to Congress by June 30, 1974, any recommendations he deems advisable for legislation which would be required for U.S. participation in an international food reserve.

May I add that this food reserve we mention in the amendment is the one that has been talked a great deal about. This amendment does not commit us to it; it merely provides that the President shall initiate a study to see whether or not it is feasible, what the costs would be, in other words, what our effort, if any, should be.

WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE AND WORLD FOOD RESERVES

Mr. President, it would be easy to write off the food shortages of the past year as aberrations due to bad weather in certain parts of the world.

But it would be irresponsible to do so. The problems we are facing can be linked to trends which go far into the past.

According to the FAO the rate of increase in agricultural production was less than the rate of population growth in 42 countries over the last decade.

In 1972 instead of an increase the developing countries suffered an actual decline of 1 percent in their agricultural production.

In the Far East the fall in total production was 4 percent, and if the population increases are added in the decline in production per capita was 6 percent.

What we are seeing are the early signs of strain on world agricultural productions and unless we start planning now for the food demands of the future the shortages we have encountered this past year are going to become ever more severe.

The United States has a special responsibility in taking the lead in planning for increasing world food needs. Our excellent climate, efficient farm organization, readily available supply of farm inputs, and favorable geographic situation make us, the American farmers, among the most productive of the world.

With about 1 percent of the world's farmers we produce about 15 percent of the world's food.

While I realize that America cannot and, if fact, should not serve as the world's cornucopia, certainly the United States should take the lead in initiating policies toward a minimum level of nutritional security for the consumers of the world in cooperation with all the nations of the world.

Furthermore, we cannot suddenly withdraw our food assistance to these countries of the less-developed world who critically depend on the United States to make ends meet and prevent mass starvation and malnutrition. We must, in consultation with the other developed countries, make a commitment toward gradually increasing the level of self-sufficiency and thereby reducing the dependence of the third world on the food supply of the developed world. This must be done first by a program which provides for direct food assistance to avert widespread starvation during time of shortages but not at a level that might inhibit domestic production.

Public Law 480 is a proven program. Over the 20 years of its existence the program has been a model for humanitarian food assistance. Now, in times of temporary domestic shortages it would not be fair to suddenly pull the rug out from under a program that has shown itself to be a successful example of what can be done to provide a crucial foundation upon which a country can move out of the mires of food crises and malnutrition and begin building toward self-sufficiency. This amendment will clarify the restrictions on Public Law 480 to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to permit continuation of our humanitarian

food assistance programs for emergency food requirements of the less-developed countries of the world.

This past year we saw a situation of mass starvation and malnutrition in many parts of the world but we were prevented from responding to the extent that was necessary because of the constraints in the language in Public Law 480.

We are not talking about any significant effect on the availability of food supplies at home.

What we are talking about is setting aside a relatively small part of our domestic production for humanitarian food assistance.

We encountered spot shortages and rising prices over this past year due to the unusual demand on our food supplies.

But food shortages meant the difference between life or death for many of the people of the less developed world.

We must also go beyond the immediate food problems to begin planning for the future food demand of the world.

My amendment also calls for a major conference of the nations of the world to meet and plan for world food needs.

The shortages and dislocation in our food supply system over this past should be testimony enough for the need to begin planning for our future food demands now.

Such a conference should not only address the simple supply demand situation but should explore all aspects which affect our food supply system including the availability of adequate supplies of fertilizer, fuel, and other farm inputs.

The conference should direct itself to the constraints on world production and explore ways to provide a reasonable level of food security for the consumers of the world.

Finally my amendment would state the Senate's belief that our country should participate in establishing a system of world food reserves—a world food bank.

I am concerned to note that the wheat stocks in the exporting countries have fallen to their lowest level in 20 years—20 years over which the world's population has grown by over 50 percent.

It has become clear that even the lowest foreseeable grain requirements over the next year cannot be covered by this year's production. This means stocks will have to be reduced even further.

The International Wheat Council predicts the world will suffer a 6- to 9-million-ton shortfall in grain supplies over the coming year.

It should be pointed out that 1 million tons of grain represents a year's minimum food supply for between 4 and 5 million people in a developing country.

What we are seeing is an increasing uncertainty in world food production created by a rapidly rising world demand.

The inability of world agricultural production to keep up with population growth compounded by rising world affluence creating a demand for more and better food places increasing strain on our agricultural systems throughout the world. We are seeing the swings in agricultural production from year to year become increasingly more significant. And, unless we can develop ways to insulate world farm production from the

effects of weather and climate or unless the countries develop a system which insures the availability of stored reserves large enough to offset the production swings, consequences for the consumers of the world will become increasingly disastrous.

It is only prudent that the producer and consumer nations of the world join together to establish an international system of strategic food reserves to provide a reasonable measure of market and price stability on world markets and to protect the poorer nations of the world from mass starvation and malnutrition when the world is confronted by bad weather which creates world shortages in basic food commodities.

We must give immediate attention to each of these issues, humanitarian food assistance programs, a world food conference and world food reserves if the world is to enjoy a minimum level of food security over the coming decades.

The stakes for the producers and consumers of the world are just too high to let policies be established in the emergency atmosphere of a new world food crisis.

We must place the emphasis on preventing a world food disaster rather than waiting for an emergency to force us to action.

Are we to be proactive or reactive?

These are the responsibilities with which the Congress and the world are challenged.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) has been deeply involved in this matter, as has the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to express my strong support for this particular proposal. It is based on a very keen personal experience, as I have been recently, through the so-called famine areas of Africa, where this problem is extremely visual and extremely poignant. So I consider it a privilege to join the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) in the proposal of this amendment.

Our operations in the food field, it seems to me, now dominate the whole matter of foreign aid. I hope ultimately the amendment will also be joined by other efforts in the world food situation. Certainly the food situation, involving problems of worldwide scarcity and the hazards which are involved because of the marginal nature of many of the economies in terms of food, and which depend so sensitively upon the vagaries of the weather and immediate crop developments and immediate crop realizations, make this amendment, to my mind, extremely attractive and very important in terms of the real purpose of our world aid, which is the subject of this bill. It represents a humanitarian concern by one of the stronger nations on earth in terms of productivity and in terms of resources. We simply cannot forgo it and remain in a peaceful and

working world which is not filled with hatred and resentment.

For this reason, and based on the argument which the Senator from Minnesota has made, which is very informative and helpful, I am privileged to join with him in hoping that this amendment will be accepted by the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. May I say this amendment is primarily the result of a conference the Senator from New York and I had some time ago. I discussed the substance of it with the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), who serves on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and is a cosponsor of the amendment. The amendment also reads: unless the Secretary determines that some part of the exportable supply should be used to carry out the national interest and humanitarian objectives of this Act—

Relating to Public Law 480.

So it makes provision for flexible authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to be helpful on the part of our Government where there is great humanitarian need.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the pending amendment focuses attention on the critical need for food and the necessity to evaluate food production potential of the peoples throughout the world. It creates a high level commission charged with the responsibility to survey and report on this need and other factors affecting food production.

The United States, through the food for peace program—Public Law 480—has been a leader in improving worldwide nutrition during recent years when our Nation's food supplies were in surplus. Now, as those surpluses have been diminished greatly, there is a natural tendency to withdraw from our participation in worldwide feeding programs. This must not happen.

I join to cosponsoring this amendment today in the interest of maintaining our participation in food for peace activities, especially those administered by America's great voluntary agencies for overseas relief and rehabilitation, organizations such as CARE, the Protestant Church World Service and Lutheran World Relief, Catholic Relief Service and its charities counterparts, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, and a number of similar privately supported humanitarian organizations.

This program is indeed worthwhile and deserves our continued support. We cannot be humanitarian only in times of surplus. We have an obligation to continue this worthwhile program.

Furthermore, Mr. President, our farmers have been asked to respond to this increased demand for food production and they are planting far greater acreage this year than ever before. Estimates show that Kansas wheat farmers have already increased acreage by 10 percent. We are not out of food. We will produce adequate grain to supply our domestic needs and still participate in these worthwhile programs for other nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, are we on controlled time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, we are on controlled time. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business is an amendment by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York have an amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I have two amendments which are routine, and I would be happy to propose them now.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York may be recognized to call up two amendments in succession at this time, without prejudice to the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 564 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

That section 17 of the Asian Development Bank Act (Public Law 92-245, March 10, 1972) is hereby amended by striking out "\$60,000,000 for fiscal year 1972 and \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 1973", and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment to section 17 of the Asian Development Bank Act. It strikes out a requirement calling for two installments, one of \$40,000,000 and one of \$60,000,000, in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 for the special fund of the bank and substitutes a single installment of \$100 million. These are two installments already which provide for an aggregate of \$100 million.

These were originally enacted on March 10, 1972, as part of a comprehensive bill making authorization for special funds in respect to the number of international financing agencies.

I believe it was the intent of the Congress in enacting this particular section that the two installments did not have to be appropriated in a particular fiscal year, but could be expended without fiscal year limitations.

We are now in fiscal year 1974 and Congress has not yet taken affirmative action on the administration request for these funds. I do not believe the fact that we have not acted should affect the authorization.

This technical amendment will remove any question that the total of \$100 mil-

October 2, 1973

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600170002-0
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 18379

lion is authorized—that is, the \$40 million and the \$60 million. It would continue, subject to appropriation, if we decided to appropriate it. But at least it will not be susceptible to a point of order that there is no authorization. I should point out that it does not involve the authorization of any additional funds.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this amendment does not add new money to the bill. It is a technical amendment. It states again that the commitments made in the past shall continue and not be vitiated by the fact that the authorizations were in the years 1972 and 1973.

There is no objection to the amendment. This is required and necessary.

On behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the amendment and thank the Senator from New York for his alertness in bringing the matter to our attention.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York (putting the question).

The amendment (No. 564) was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is this amendment a printed amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. No, it is not. However, again it is not a matter of terribly great importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 18, line 16, immediately after the semicolon, insert the following: "the Deputy Under Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Labor;"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be noted that there is a section dealing with coordination of various Cabinet agencies which are concerned with foreign aid.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is an acceptable amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for Legislative Affairs of the Department of Labor which describes this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

Washington, D.C., September 28, 1973.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Your assistance in connection with the matter described below will be very much appreciated.

Section 640B of S. 2335, "A Bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961," calls for the President to establish a Development Coordination Committee to "advise him and the Congress with respect to coordination of United States policies and programs affecting the development of the developing countries, including programs of bilateral and multilateral development assistance." In

naming the Committee members the Bill omits the Department of Labor. The House version of this Bill, H.R. 9360, includes the Department of Labor among the agencies of the Executive Branch on the Committee.

There are two major reasons why a representative of the Department of Labor should be included on the Development Coordination Committee.

Many of the policies and programs initiated under the Foreign Assistance Act will have an impact on employment, wages, and working conditions in the United States, matters for which the Department of Labor bears major responsibility within the Executive Branch. At present the Department is deeply involved in providing information and advice with respect to international trade and investment matters affecting U.S. workers through its membership on the Council on International Economic Policy and through its participation in the inter-agency trade organization. It would be both advantageous to and consistent with this role for the Department to assist in the coordination of policies and programs under the Foreign Assistance Act to ensure that the impact of such policies and programs on employment, wages, and working condition in the United States is taken fully into account.

In addition, one of the three main thrusts of the proposed legislation is education and human resources development, with prominence given to the need "to increase manpower training in skills related to development" (Section 105). The Labor Department has extensive responsibilities and expertise in the manpower field. For years it has collaborated with AID and various multilateral agencies in international activities designed to assist the developing nations. This work has involved: training large numbers of foreign labor and manpower technicians; providing American experts for overseas assignments; and research and preparation of technical manuals for use in developing countries. The Department's expertise and experience should continue to be drawn upon in the formulation of manpower policies and programs for the developing countries. Moreover, the growing emphasis being given to questions of employment and income distribution in both our bilateral and multilateral foreign assistance efforts underscores the appropriateness and desirability of Department of Labor participation on the Coordination Committee.

The officer within the Department of Labor who is responsible for international activities and who is analogous to the officers named for the other agencies in the Senate Bill is the Deputy Under Secretary of Labor for International Affairs. He, therefore, would be the appropriate officer to represent the Department on the Committee and should be named in Section 640B (a) of the Senate Bill.

Sincerely,
BENJAMIN L. BROWN,
Deputy Under Secretary for
Legislative Affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment adds the Department of Labor to the agencies in the executive branch who function on this coordination committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is the development coordination committee which we establish in this legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a desirable amendment. I certainly accept it on behalf of the committee. I hope that it will be voted on favorably. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. (Putting the question.)

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, with respect to the two amendments which the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) is scheduled to call up at this time in consecutive order—and in connection with which, I understand, he will want a ye-a-and-nay vote on both amendments—I ask unanimous consent that the first ye-a-and-nay vote occur at 1:30 p.m. today and that the second vote occur first ye-a-and-nay vote, and that beginning with the second ye-a-and-nay vote, there be a time limitation on that vote and on all other ye-a-and-nay votes, during the afternoon, of 10 minutes, with the warning bells to sound after the first 2½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the time limitation on the amendments of the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes, to be equally divided.

The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield for a parliamentary inquiry, would the situation not be this in response to the amendments of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the time on both Church amendments would be limited to a total of 45 minutes en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If they are offered en bloc, by unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, with the vote to occur on the first amendment at 1:30 p.m. and the vote on the second amendment to occur immediately thereafter at 1:45 p.m., are we not limited to a total of 45 minutes for debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a vote is to occur on the first amendment at 1:30, and there will be back to back votes, and we will be voting on the second amendment immediately thereafter. Is there not just 45 minutes to be equally divided on both amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I propose these amendments be offered ad seriatim and statements be made for both of them. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to respond, I ask that he give me 3 minutes at the end of the debate to sum up my side. Is that agreeable?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, would the Senator from Idaho tell us what his amendments are? They are not printed or typed.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will tell us, it will help me as the Senator goes along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Idaho send his first amendment to the desk so that the clerk may report it?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send an

S 18380

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 2, 1973

amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

SEC. 24. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$1,100,000,000 in addition to funds made available pursuant to section 203 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated during fiscal year 1974 to carry out parts I and V and section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the authorization level in the bill by \$134 million, giving the President full flexibility to make the cuts where he sees fit.

Mr. AIKEN. What about the second amendment?

Mr. CHURCH. The second amendment would restore to Congress the right of both authorizing and appropriating debt moneys repaid by foreign governments. At present, such moneys are collected into a revolving fund administered by the AID agency.

Mr. AIKEN. It would eliminate the loan reflows to AID, or the revolving fund?

Mr. CHURCH. It would eliminate the revolving fund; it would restore the authority to Congress to decide what part of that money should go back to AID, and what part should be used for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. It comes back to the Congress.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator is correct. Now it is recaptured by USAID.

Mr. President, the first amendment I have sent to the desk is a simple one. It is designed to help balance the budget. It would establish a ceiling of \$1.1 billion on obligations that can be made during fiscal year 1974 for the programs authorized in this bill.

The amounts in the bill before the Senate appear modest, as foreign aid bills go. But this bill is only the tip of the foreign aid iceberg. The \$1.2 billion authorized in S. 2335 represents less than 15 percent of the \$8.6 billion foreign aid package proposed by the executive branch for this fiscal year.

Since this is little understood, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table listing the many different foreign aid programs, which will total \$8.6 billion during the coming fiscal year—to be exact, \$8,643,349,000—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Transfers of U.S. resources to foreign nations—worldwide distribution by program.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1974 proposed
Grand Total of All U.S. Resources Transferred—Security Assistance (Subtotal)	8,643,349
Military assistance program	4,111,417
Distributed by country	771,500
	(648,727)

Not distributed by country	(122,773)
Int. mil. education and training program	33,000
Distributed by country	(30,123)
Not distributed by country	(2,877)
Military assistance service funded	1,870,800
Distributed by country	(1,870,800)
MAAG administrative costs—military department funded	52,409
Distributed by country	(52,409)
Transfer of defense stocks	—
Distributed by country	—
Excess defense articles	185,000
Distributed by country	(185,000)
Not distributed by country	—
Ships transfers, distributed by country	6,500
Real property transfer	244,553
Security supporting assistance	124,055
Distributed by country	(117,500)
Not distributed by country	(8,555)
Foreign military credit sales	760,000
Distributed by country	(760,000)
Export-Import military loans (n.a.)	—
Distributed by country (n.a.)	—
Public Law 480 (Sec. 104(c), dist. by country)	(182,080)
Purchase of local currency (Vietnam)	63,800
Indochina postwar reconstruction subtotal	630,945
Distributed by country	(614,000)
Not distributed by country	(16,945)
Development assistance—subtotal	3,900,987
Agency for International Development	(1,338,314)
Development loans—Distributed by country	596,000
Not distributed by country	49,000
Development grants—Distributed by country	102,725
Not distributed by country	84,525
Population programs—Distributed by country	37,071
Not distributed by country	9,875
South Asian relief	500
American schools and hospitals abroad	10,000
Not distributed by country	—
International organizations and programs—Not distributed by country	177,122
Administrative expenses—Not distributed by country	57,875
Administrative expenses—State	5,100
International narcotics control and contingency fund—Distributed by country	20,481
Contingency fund, undistributed	30,300
Narcotics, undistributed	9,738
Program support and interregional activities—Not distributed by country	148,202
Peace Corps—Distributed by country	51,463
Not distributed by country	6,543
General support	18,995
Public Law 480—Distributed by country	976,575
Not distributed by country	22,345
Ocean freight	117,700
Grants of title I, section 204	1,000
Private trade entities	10,000
Emergency reserve	19,180
U.S. Contributions to international financial institutions:	
IBRD—Paid-in capital	—
Callable capital	—
International Development Association	320,000
Inter-American Development Bank:	
Paid-in capital	25,000
Callable capital	(168,380)
Fund for special operations	500,000

Asian Development Bank:	
Paid-in capital	24,200
Callable capital	(96,800)
Special funds	100,000
State Department migration and refugee programs—Not distributed by country	7,600
Inter-American Foundation	13,285
Pan American Highway	30,000
Darien Gap Highway	—
Mutual education and cultural exchange	38,557
Nonregional	14,443
Trust Territories of the Pacific	68,000
Contribution to international organizations—State Department	199,787

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I point out also that there is already \$2.7 billion in the pipeline for the programs included in this bill, two and a half times the authorizations allowed under my amendment. And Members should also realize that in addition to the \$1.1 billion of new money my amendment would allow, \$251 million more is available to AID from repayments on outstanding foreign aid loans.

Our Government's fiscal situation is in terrible shape. Over \$100 billion in deficits in the regular Federal budget have been run up in the last 5 fiscal years. Interest on the Federal debt will cost some \$27 billion this year and is mounting steadily. The Government is now borrowing money at 8½ percent to lend to foreign governments at 2 percent.

The President has asked Congress to hold the line on spending for domestic programs. There is no doubt that the Federal budget should be balanced and deficit spending ended. But I do not agree that domestic programs should absorb all of the cuts for budget balancing purposes, as the President proposes. Foreign aid should bear its fair share of the burden of bringing our financial house in order.

My proposal would only make a modest reduction of \$134 million in the spending level recommended by the committee. It would do this not by cutting specific programs, but by imposing a ceiling on obligations. Thus, it would leave the President with complete flexibility to apply the cuts as he sees fit. He could make the reductions in loans, grants, aid to Indochina, contributions to international organizations, administrative expenses, or any of the other categories in the bill.

Mr. President, I remember vividly how we discussed the need to balance the budget and to establish a spending ceiling in the early months of this session. I see little evidence that we will accomplish that goal. Furthermore, I can recall how enthusiastically members of the Democratic Caucus called for these cuts to be made in military spending and in spending abroad, rather than in domestic programs, as the means of balancing the budget and living within the ceiling that Congress and the President have prescribed.

If we are to have any chance of succeeding, it is necessary that this foreign aid bill be cut, at a minimum, by the amount proposed in this amendment. Even so, we still will have a long way to go, if Congress is to fulfill its pledge to

live within its own spending ceiling. That, Mr. President, sums up the case for the first amendment I have offered.

I now ask that the Senate proceed to consideration of the second amendment I have sent to the desk.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 9, strike out lines 13 through 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 3, Section 203 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is repealed.

Mr. **CHURCH.** Mr. President, this amendment would help to restore congressional control over the foreign aid program. It returns to Congress the pursestrings for a quarter billion dollars now held by the executive branch. Members will be surprised to learn that the bill now before the Senate is close to a quarter of a billion dollars bigger than it looks.

My amendment is very simple. It would require that Congress authorize and appropriate, in the regular manner, all funds for use in the foreign aid program. Strange as it may seem, this is not the case under existing law, a condition that would be continued by this bill. Under existing law, Congress is deceived about the amounts it thinks it authorizes and appropriates for the foreign aid loan program—loans made for 40 years with 2 percent interest the first 10 years and 3 percent for the next 30 years. Take this bill, for example. The table on page 2 of the committee report shows that, under the continuing resolution, development loans can be made at an annual rate of \$310 million and that, under the new aid categories, a total of \$592 million will be available for both loans and grants. But these figures do not show that \$251 million more will be available this fiscal year for lending purposes from repayments on outstanding foreign aid loans. Nowhere in this bill will you find that quarter of a billion dollars listed. This is not a \$1.23 billion foreign aid bill; it is a \$1.48 billion bill, immensely more than meets the eye.

I would hazard the guess that few, if any, members outside the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees realize that this additional money is made available each year—almost automatically and without any real congressional scrutiny. And the total is growing yearly. In 4 years, the money from loan repayments that will be available under existing law will increase to \$416 million. This practice is deceptive of Congress and deceptive of the public.

Repayments on foreign aid loans should go into the Treasury. If a case can be made for using these additional funds in the foreign aid program, a straightforward authorization and appropriation request should be submitted to Congress each year by the President. This method for circumventing Congress should end.

I recognize that the executive branch, of course, wants to keep things the way they are—so that these hundreds of millions will not be subjected to the gamut of the regular authorization and appropriations processes.

Foreign aid officials know that Congress would take a dim view of voting an

extra quarter of a billion this year for 2-percent loans to foreign countries when the Government is borrowing its money at 8½ percent.

This is a clear-cut example of how Congress has allowed its authority to erode to the advantage of the executive branch. Approval of my amendment will be a step toward restoring Congress control over the purse strings.

So I urge the Senate to adopt it.

That concludes, Mr. President, the case that I intend to make for the two amendments that I have offered. Aside from the time I should like to reserve for rebuttal, I suggest that the floor manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), may want to take the remaining time to respond as he sees fit.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. **JAVITS.** Five minutes.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **JAVITS.** Mr. President, I have heard the arguments of the Senator from Idaho with great interest. He took very much the same position before our committee. I hope very much that that position will not be sustained and for the following reasons:

We are already making material cuts in foreign aid. Indeed, the Senate's proposal is \$300 million less than that adopted by the House. We are facing a real issue of morality in this particular situation because we are simply thumbing down on foreign aid both absolutely in terms of our own position and relatively in terms of the position of other countries, which is almost shameful in terms of the fact that relatively speaking we are the major "have" nation when two-thirds of the world are in the "have not" category.

I do not believe it is worth the \$134 million for the United States to put itself in the position of incurring more hatred and resentment, which is growing—as we whittle down, and whittle down again with respect to foreign aid—among developing countries in the world. It is growing and I have seen it grow and so has every other Member who has gone to any meeting or conference around the world, including the United Nations, which involves the developing areas of the world, which are mindful of what this relatively affluent Nation of ours is doing with respect to trying to help them out of the morass in which they have found themselves for so many decades.

The argument is made to cut it down because it is not effective, when the fact is that this amendment comes at the moment when we are trying totally new criteria with respect to foreign aid.

The report on page 4 clearly states:

This year, in providing for the continuation of a U.S. bilateral program, the Committee has taken determined action to focus our aid efforts more sharply upon the world's poor. Under the provisions in the bill re-

ported by the Committee, bilateral development aid would be concentrated on direct problem-solving, and considerably less emphasis than in the past would be accorded to large scale capital projects and general purpose resource transfers. Funds in the bill would be allocated specifically in categories reflecting the most common and pervasive development problems: food production, rural development, and nutrition; population planning and health; and education and human resources development.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that we are not even talking about \$1.2 billion because \$376 million is for economic assistance in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and we can be sure that if this cut is made, it will not come out of those countries, which represent, in essence, defense support—but will come out of the backs of the poorest people on Earth.

We have cut down and cut down until today we are responsible, in the public sense, for a fraction of 1 percent, not the United Nations' criterion of the 1 percent to which we ourselves subscribed. I know that, because I made the speech at the United Nations by authority of the President in 1970 when I was a general delegate there.

One other point. One of the excuses for cutting down, which we have already done with respect to a bilateral foreign aid program, has been the fact that we are building up and financing an international organization, like the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank. But the fact is that we are not following through on these commitments. One of the crying needs for appropriations is precisely in those particular areas. It only compounds the deplorable situation in which our country would find itself were it to make this proposed further cut.

Finally, and I think this is a conclusive argument, we have a new Secretary of State. We have a new posture regarding foreign policy. We have done our utmost to make a success of our foreign policy. Most of us understand the grave deficiencies in our domestic policy. Let us not make the mistake of putting in danger our progress in foreign affairs by such a shortsighted proposal as this.

For these reasons, I believe the committee has done more than enough to accept the conception of an economy that proportionately will make certain that we have a well-planned rather than an undeveloped foreign assistance program.

Mr. **AIKEN.** Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that, as I understand the second amendment of the Senator from Idaho, it would eliminate the loan reflow authority. I do not think this is the time when we can cut down on our cooperation with other countries to that extent. We approved an amendment this morning—and the other day, too—which I was not happy about, which puts the squeeze on India, or would if that amendment were carried out as it might be interpreted.

I do not think that countries like India, Bangladesh, and many other coun-

tries can do the job if our assistance to them is reduced at this time.

This \$385 million cut which is what the two amendments provide—is pretty heavy—pretty heavy, indeed. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment. I opposed the first amendment, which would set a ceiling of \$1.1 billion, because it would have the effect of reducing the authorization in the bill by \$134 million. I note again that the Senate's appropriation for the fiscal year 1973 was \$1,493,000,000. If we were to adopt this authorization ceiling without regard to what the Committee on Appropriations does, that would mean a reduction of \$393 million since fiscal 1973, despite the fact that during that period of time inflation has caused a reduction in the value of the dollar.

Mr. President, the committee has already cut the administration's request by \$376 million. We have acted with the greatest care in trying to economize under this program.

The amounts in this bill are already the lowest recommended for these activities in foreign aid since the foreign aid program began. So we are being prudent.

I regret that this Chamber is not filled, so that Senators would know that we have done what the Senate has asked us to do. We have cut, and cut deeply.

The Senator alleges that Congress is kept in the dark about the use of the repayments on outstanding development loans. I respectfully suggest that this is simply not true. Not one penny of these funds can be used without passage of authorization and appropriations bills. Four committees go over this item each year and any one of them can vote to deny the use of these repayments for additional lending.

AID does not get this money automatically. It takes specific approval in both the authorizing and the appropriations process for these funds to be made available. This is not a process where the wool is pulled over Congress' eyes. Congress has been clearly told by AID each year what they plan to do with the money and Congress has consistently given its approval in both the authorization bill and the appropriations bill.

The AID congressional presentation materials clearly show how these funds are to be used—every chart showing the proposed AID program includes these reflow funds. The facts are fully laid out for anyone who has enough interest to look.

The authority for use of the repayments on outstanding foreign aid loans for making new loans is nothing new. It has existed since the beginning of the current development loan program. It is entirely proper that these repayments be used for making additional loans. To do so is to use the money for precisely the same purpose for which it was appropriated by Congress in the first place.

One final point: If the Senator's amendment is approved it will have the effect of cutting the development loan program approved by the committee by about one-half—a reduction of \$251,000,000. This would be on top of the 20-

percent reduction already made by the committee in the administration's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself an additional minute.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might call attention to the fact that if we take into consideration the devaluation of the currency, the cut is much more than it appears to be on paper.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed. This amendment, if adopted, would amount to a total cut of 35 percent in the program, and we have already trimmed the program by almost 26 percent.

I believe it would be unwise for us to accept this amendment or to approve it.

This reflow amendment was before the committee, was argued in committee, was debated in committee, and the committee rejected it. I hope the Senate will reject it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the authorization and appropriation history for economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and predecessor legislation, including supplementals, be printed at this point in the Record, showing exactly what the authorizations are, what the appropriations are, and the reflow.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION HISTORY FOR ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961 AND PREDECESSOR LEGISLATION (INCLUDING SUPPLEMENTALS) FISCAL YEAR 1948-73

(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Authorization request ¹	Authorized by Congress ²	Appropriation request ³	Appropriated by Congress
1948-49.....	7,370.0	6,913.0	7,370.0	6,446.3
1950.....	4,280.0	4,280.0	4,280.0	3,728.4
1951.....	2,950.0	2,762.5	2,950.0	2,262.5
1952.....	2,197.0	1,585.7	2,197.0	1,540.4
1953.....	2,475.3	1,894.3	2,499.0	1,782.1
1954.....	1,543.2	1,475.7	1,543.2	1,301.5
1955.....	1,798.1	1,571.9	1,788.5	1,528.8
1956.....	1,812.8	1,851.8	1,812.8	1,681.1
1957.....	1,860.0	1,815.1	1,860.0	1,749.1
1958.....	1,964.4	1,786.9	1,964.4	1,428.9
1959.....	2,142.1	2,070.6	2,142.1	1,933.1
1960.....	2,330.0	2,176.8	2,330.0	1,925.8
1961.....	2,875.3	2,786.3	2,875.0	2,631.4
1962.....	2,883.5	2,539.5	2,883.5	2,314.6
1963.....	3,281.3	3,074.8	3,281.3	2,573.9
1964.....	3,124.5	2,602.1	3,124.6	2,000.0
1965.....	2,461.7	2,452.0	2,461.7	2,195.6
1966.....	2,704.5	2,605.0	2,704.5	2,463.0
1967.....	3,443.4	2,628.0	2,469.0	2,143.5
1968.....	2,785.6	2,165.0	2,630.4	1,895.6
1969.....	2,554.2	1,609.8	2,498.5	1,380.6
1970.....	2,210.0	1,624.2	2,210.0	1,424.9
1971.....	2,093.7	2,093.7	2,008.0	1,733.9
1972.....	2,355.2	1,868.6	2,355.2	1,718.2
1973.....	*1,970.5	*1,026.5	2,256.6	*1,664.2

¹ Adjusted to fiscal year basis and including executive branch adjustments.

² Adjusted to fiscal year basis.

³ Includes borrowing authority (other than for investment guarantees) during Marshall plan period April 1948-52.

⁴ Includes \$984,000,000 authorized in fiscal year 1972 for development assistance programs in fiscal year 1973.

⁵ Excludes supporting assistance and refugee relief assistance (Bangladesh) which were not authorized in fiscal year 1973.

⁶ Represents annual rate contained in the continuing resolution (Public Law 93-9, Mar. 8, 1973).

Note: Excludes investment guaranty program (borrowing authority and appropriations) and OPIC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for 1 minute, for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been reading the editorial opinion in the country. I have before me two editorials from leading newspapers—the Washington Post and the New York Times—one captioned "A Responsible Foreign Aid Policy," the other "Innovative Aid Reform." The new direction of foreign aid has been widely hailed in editorial opinion throughout the country.

Does not the Senator feel that it is a sheer construction of good faith in undertaking a totally new program directed to the most poor and the most dire situation; that because these amendments have been very carefully debated and considered by the committee, the Senate ought to at least, for this once, abide by our judgment and give this matter a chance?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my view, of course; but every Senator has a right to modify legislation.

I know the views of the distinguished Senator from Idaho. I have a high regard for him personally, publicly, and officially, particularly in matters that relate particularly to foreign policy. But I feel that his amendments go too far.

If this bill had not been reduced, I would say there should be a cut. But we have made a 25- to 26-percent reduction. As the Senator from Vermont has said, if we should accept these amendments, we would, for all practical purposes, wreck this bill.

More than that, this money will come out of the categories that relate to food production, nutrition, health, education, and training. That would be a sad mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has 7 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished floor manager of the bill knows the score, and I like to think that I know the score as well.

All the discussion concerning reductions in this program amounts to just so much juggling of figures. The important figure to look at, if one really wants to know whether or not this program is being reduced, is the figure contained in the continuing resolution. That represents the existing level of foreign aid spending. The House bill is 11 or 12 percent above the continuing resolution. The Senate bill, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, is 11½ percent below the continuing resolution. It may be that these near-identical percentages are just coincidental, but I do not think so.

The effort here is to pass a bill that will then go to conference, where the differences in the money amounts will be

split between the two Houses. In that process, we will come out with foreign aid spending preserved at the current level. In other words, the real undertaking here is to keep foreign aid spending at the current level and, if possible, to increase it just a bit. Unless my amendment is adopted, this is what will happen.

If my first amendment is adopted, we will a modest reduction of \$134 million, which would likely come out of conference at about \$50 million or \$60 million. I suggest that it is a very small cut, indeed.

Even though I have long since grown disenchanted with the bilateral aid program, having concluded that it does serve the goals its advocates proclaim, the case for this amendment can be based solely upon the financial difficulties within our own country. The best argument that can be made for it is the fact that we are now suffering through the worst inflation in the century, aggravated by enormous Federal deficits which bespeak the urgent need to reduce Federal spending.

Here is a place to do it, and to do it in a way that will not bring down either the wrath of the world upon us or cause the collapse of foreign aid.

As a matter of fact, as I have already pointed out, that program does not amount to \$1,234,000,000, the authorized level of this bill. This is only a small part of a total foreign aid program that actually will come to between \$8 billion and \$9 billion this year, when all categories of aid are added together.

If Senators wish to make any reduction in the present level of the economic aid program, this amendment represents their opportunity to do it. If they accept the bill as the committee reported it, they will continue foreign aid spending at approximately present levels, once the measure works its way through the legislative process.

In regard to the second amendment, I suggest the present method of handling reflows does pull the wool over the eyes of Congress. The Senator from Minnesota knows that a quarter billion dollars of returned payments on past loans this year will revert to foreign aid; I submit, however, that most Senators and Members of Congress do not know this. It is not a line item in any appropriation bill, it is buried in the fine print of the law; it is a way to circumvent the normal process by which Congress scrutinizes public expenditures; it should be stopped.

Anyone who believes Congress should undertake to tighten its grip on the Federal purse strings should support this amendment. Those who would give only lip service to that cause, by leaving it to the AID agency to recapture the money and reloan it to foreign governments, support a method that, in effect, circumvents the Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the new foreign aid program. It does come to us in new wrappings, yet it is still the same program underneath. The wrappings are designed to appeal to our best instincts. Since day-to-day politics are largely determined by the

packaging, it may be that the committee version of the aid bill will pass unaltered. However, it is the same old program still, whatever the wrappings.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will approve both amendments.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is not in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may we divide the time on a quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a call of the quorum and that the time be equally divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has all the time remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I am very glad to divide it on that basis with my dear and distinguished friend from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two votes which were scheduled to begin at the hour of 1:30 p.m. today begin at the hour of 1:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back his time on the pending amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sorry. I thought we were finished. I yield back all my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

PRISONERS OF WAR AND INDIVIDUALS MISSING IN ACTION

SEC. 23. (a) The Senate declares that—
(1) the families of those 1,300 individuals missing in action during the Indochina conflict have suffered extraordinary torment in ascertaining the full and complete information about their loved ones who are formally classified as missing in action;

(2) United States involvement in the Indochina conflict has come to a negotiated end with the signing of the Vietnam Agreement in Paris on January 27, 1973, and section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1973, requires that "None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam by United States forces, and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose";

(3) the question of the return of prisoners of war and accounting for individuals miss-

ing in action and dead in Laos is covered by article 18 of the Protocol signed by representatives of the Lao Patriotic Front (Pathet Lao) and the Royal Laotian Government in Vientiane on September 14, 1973 (which implements article 5 of the Agreement signed by the Pathet Lao and that government in Vientiane on February 21, 1973, requiring the release of all prisoners "regardless of nationality" captured and held in Laos), and paragraph C of such article 18 provides that, within "15 to 30 days" from the date of the signing of the Protocol, each side is to report the number of those prisoners and individuals still held, with an indication of their nationality and status, together with a list of names and any who dies in captivity; and
(4) few of the United States men lost in Laos during the military engagements in Indochina have been returned, and with knowledge about many of these men has yet been fully disclosed, and the North Vietnam cease-fire provisions calling for inspection of crash and grave sites and for other forms of cooperation have not been fully complied with.

(b) It is, therefore, the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the provisions for the release of prisoners and an accounting of individuals missing and dead, as provided for in article 18 of the Protocol signed on September 14, 1973, by the Pathet Lao and the Royal Laotian Government, be adhered to in spirit and in deed; and

(2) the faithful compliance with the spirit of the Laotian Agreement and Protocol on the question of individuals missing in action will encourage all parties in Indochina to cooperate in providing complete information on all nationals of any nation who may be captured or missing at any place in Indochina.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, more than 8 months ago representatives of the U.S. Government signed the Vietnam agreement in Paris marking a negotiated end to the Indochina conflict.

Soon thereafter, 591 American prisoners of war rejoined their families after long years of separation.

Many of us would like to think that this marked the end to what seemed to be an endless ordeal for the peoples of the United States and Indochina. But that is, unfortunately, just not the case. For the families of 1,300 men missing in action in Indochina, there is no end to the tormenting questions about their loved ones.

A recent development occurred in Vientiane Laos to give these families new hope, however. On September 14, 1973, the representatives of the Royal Laotian Government and the Lao Patriotic Front—Pathet Lao—signed a protocol pursuant to their agreement of February 21, 1973. Article 18, in particular, spells out detailed provisions agreed to by the two Lao parties for release of prisoners and accounting for the missing in Laos.

According to an official State Department analyst of POW/MIA provisions of the Laos Protocol:

The language of Article 18 requires the release of all prisoners regardless of nationality captured and held in Laos. This would apply to Lao personnel, to other Indochinese, and, of course, to any Americans. . . . Paragraph C of Article 18 provides that within "15 to 30 days" from the date of signing of the Protocol (September 14) each side is to report the number of those still held, with indication of their nationality and status, together with a list of names of any who died

October 2, 1973

S 18384

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

in captivity. . . . If this provision is observed, information on the number of those held, and the list of names of those who died in captivity, should be provided no later than October 14, 1973.

Mr. President, we are at a very crucial juncture in our long-standing efforts to learn about the fate of the 1,300 men missing in Indochina, some 327 of them in or near Laos.

Mr. President, a show of Senate concern and resolve is absolutely essential at this stage. The end of the period of 15 to 30 days from the signing of the protocol on September 14—the time prescribed in the protocol when the Laotian parties are to report the number, nationality, and status of those men held and the names of any who died in captivity—is in only a matter of weeks.

This amendment, which is really a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which I am calling up today is an effort to encourage resolution of the status of the missing in action. It appeals to the well acknowledged humanitarian reputation of the Laotian people. And it is directed to them as a reinforcement of all the unflagging efforts of those who, with understandable concern, still seek news about their unforgotten loved ones.

This resolution, it is further hoped, will also serve as an encouragement for all parties concerned in Indochina to cooperate in providing complete information to the families of all 1,300 Americans who may be captured or missing anywhere in Indochina.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES) be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. I also ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, might I just ask the Senator a question, on my time? In section 23 of the Senator's amendment he says, "The Senate declares that * * * I believe the Senator should change that to, "The Congress declares."

Mr. NELSON. That is correct. I modify my amendment to include the word "Congress" for "Senate" in the language.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in one other place there is reference to "Senate." It should be changed to "Congress."

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct. I amend my amendment to use the word "Congress" anyplace where the word "Senate" is used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for this amendment. There is no subject that is closer to the hearts of the American people with reference to the

tragic war in Indochina than what we call the missing in action. We want to make sure that every conceivable effort is made by our Government and other governments, international organizations, to ascertain whether these men are really missing in action, or whether they are prisoners of war, or whether they are casualties or dead.

The purpose of the amendment is quite obvious. It states that the families of 1,300 individuals are suffering great anguish here in America because they are not getting any information as to what is happening to their loved ones. The amendment merely states that faithful compliance with the Laotian agreement and the protocol on individuals missing in action will encourage all parties in Indochina to cooperate in providing complete information on all individuals who may be captured or missing at any place in Indochina.

I want to thank the Senator for bringing this matter to our attention. I am sure this will be a source of reassurance to the families of the 1,300 Americans who are listed as missing in action.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I think many of the people who have relatives, sons, or brothers who are missing in action frequently feel that not enough is being done to retain the issue in the public forum for constant reference and pressure. We must continue to do whatever we can do to get word and information on all of those missing in action.

I ask unanimous consent that the very brief amendment, as modified, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment, as modified, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

PRISONERS OF WAR AND INDIVIDUALS MISSING IN ACTION

Sec. 23. (a) The Congress declares that—

(1) the families of those 1,300 individuals missing in action during the Indochina conflict have suffered extraordinary torment in ascertaining the full and complete information about their loved ones who are formally classified as missing in action;

(2) United States involvement in the Indochina conflict has come to a negotiated end with the signing of the Vietnam Agreement in Paris on January 27, 1973, and section 307 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1973, requires that "None of the funds herein appropriated under this Act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in or over Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam or off the shores of Cambodia, Laos, North Vietnam and South Vietnam by United States forces and after August 15, 1973, no other funds heretofore appropriated under any other Act may be expended for such purpose.";

(3) the question of the return of prisoners of war and accounting for individuals missing in action and dead in Laos is covered by article 18 of the Protocol signed by representatives of the Lao Patriotic Front (Pathet Lao) and the Royal Laotian Government in Vientiane on September 14, 1973 (which implements article 5 of the Agreement signed by the Pathet Lao and that government in Vientiane on February 21, 1973, requiring the release of all prisoners "regardless of nationality" captured and held in Laos), and para-

graph C of such article 18 provides that, within "15 to 30 days" from the date of the signing of the Protocol, each side is to report the number of those prisoners and individuals still held, with an indication of their nationality and status, together with a list of names and any who dies in captivity; and

(4) few of the United States men lost in Laos during the military engagements in Indochina have been returned, and knowledge about many of these men has yet been fully disclosed, and the North Vietnam cease-fire provisions calling for inspection of crash and grave sites and for other forms of cooperation have not been fully complied with.

(b) It is therefore, the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the provisions for the release of prisoners and an accounting of individuals missing and dead, as provided for in article 18 of the Protocol signed on September 14, 1973, by the Pathet Lao and the Royal Laotian Government, be adhered to in spirit and in deed; and

(2) the faithful compliance with the spirit of the Laotian Agreement and Protocol on the question of individuals missing in action will encourage all parties in Indochina to cooperate in providing complete information on all nationals of any nation who may be captured or missing at any place in Indochina.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I feel that there is no need for further use of time on this side, because we are in full concurrence with the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. Therefore, I yield back all time on this side.

Mr. NELSON. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays on both Church amendments at this time with one show of seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am waiting for the Senator from Indiana, who, I believe, is on the way and has an amendment that he wishes to be brought up. I do not know whether any other Senator at this point has an amendment he wants to bring up.

May I suggest, therefore, on the time on the bill—we still have considerable time left—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour on each side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment, No. 502, as modified, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

"Sec. 23. Chapter 8 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291) as amended, relating to international narcotics control, is further amended

(1) by inserting in section 481 "(a)" immediately after "INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.—";

(2) by inserting in section 481 "(b)" immediately after the first sentence and before the beginning of the second sentence which reads, "In order to promote";

(3) by striking out of section 431 the fourth sentence to the end which begins with "The President shall suspend" and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(c) The President (or his delegate) shall cause to be suspended all foreign assistance, tangible or intangible, including but not limited to gifts, loans, credit sales, or guarantees to each country, except as provided in (b) of this section, when such aid is rejected by the Congress in accordance with subsection (b) of section 482 of this chapter.":

(4) by striking "Sec. 482.", and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec. 483.";

(5) by inserting the following:

"Sec. 482. (a) The President shall make an affirmative finding that a country is taking adequate steps, as set forth in (c) of this section, to control the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives within ninety days of the enactment of this section and each year thereafter, which finding shall be submitted to the Congress the first day of June of each year.

"(b) Within ninety days following the submission of such affirmative findings, the Congress may adopt a concurrent resolution rejecting such findings as to any or all countries, whereupon the President shall immediately suspend all foreign assistance to such country in accordance with section 481 of this chapter.

"(c) The Secretary of State, after coordination and consultation with all other departments or agencies involved with the control of the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives, shall set forth those measures which constitute a good faith effort to control illicit opium and its derivatives. Such measures may reflect the individuality of a country, but shall include the following:

"(1) the enactment of criminal laws controlling the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives;

"(2) the establishment of a viable agency to enforce criminal laws controlling the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives;

"(3) the vigorous enforcement of criminal laws controlling the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives;

"(4) the full cooperation of such country with all United States departments or

agencies involved in the interdiction of the supply of illicit opium, and its derivatives, into the United States;

"(5) the establishment of border procedures for the interdiction of opium and its derivatives, out of or into such country;

"(6) the destruction of all illicit opium and its derivatives after its evidentiary use has expired; and

"(7) the establishment of detailed procedures for the control of all legal production, transportation, distribution, or manufacture of opium and its derivatives."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am today raising an amendment to the foreign assistance bill to prohibit foreign assistance to those countries which refuse to take adequate measures to end illicit opium production.

Mr. President, section 481 of the Foreign Economic Assistance Act authorizes the President to suspend military and economic assistance to those nations which he determines have not taken adequate steps to suppress dangerous drugs. The President fully embraced this responsibility on September 18, 1972, when he proclaimed—

Any government whose leaders participate in or protect the activities of those who contribute to our drug problem should know that the President of the United States is required by statute to suspend all American economic and military assistance to such a regime. I shall not hesitate to comply fully and promptly with that statute.

Apparently the President feels that there are no nations which continue to be lax in their control of heroin and other related hard drugs. And he most certainly must not suspect that some governments are completely ignoring drug traffic. The Congress, however, knows better. The existing situation demands a clear formulation of the intent of Congress in the Foreign Assistance Act if we are to be conscientious in our effort to end the drug problem in America.

Congressional study and journalistic research have brought forth incontrovertible evidence that a number of governments are simply not complying with the requests of the U.S. Government to vigorously suppress drug traffic. Yet no action has been taken by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the July 1973 report of a special study mission entitled "The Narcotics Situation in Southeast Asia," submitted to the House of Representatives' Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Honorable Lester L. Wolff, be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The White House denies that their program of piecemeal efforts is insufficient, claiming that there have been "important breakthroughs and huge seizures." These huge seizures amount to confiscating 29 tons of opium in Laos, South Vietnam, and Thailand. In the face of the total production of illicit opium in this area, the seizures amount to only 3 or 4 percent.

Mr. President, Congress gave the power to terminate economic and military assistance to the President only because we know that customs agents and border patrols cannot singlehandedly reduce

smuggling of heroin. A General Accounting Office report stated, in reference to customs operations, that—

Although these efforts may deter amateurs and small-scale smugglers they have not had and probably cannot have any real impact on the organized groups engaged in large-scale heroin smuggling.

Customs does act as a strong deterrent, but it simply cannot stop the main bulk of heroin reaching the streets of America, addicting our citizens, filling the coffers of organized crime, and accounting for nearly half of the crimes committed in our cities. Profits in the drug trade are enormous. A \$100,000 investment by stateside financiers can yield \$2 million within 6 months; 10 or 15 tons of heroin, originally costing \$5 million will take a turnover for American dealers of \$9.8 billion. With profits as high as this, as long as there is a source and a reasonably safe route of transit, there will most assuredly be successful smuggling of heroin into the United States to feed the veins of American addicts.

The logic behind section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act was to stop heroin at its source. Perhaps the flaw in our legislation has been that the President alone is left to decide whether or not a government's cooperation has been adequate. As we know, there are many countries in violation of the intent of Congress. Yet, section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 leaves the President to decide which governments are taking adequate steps to control the illicit production, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives.

Gen. Lewis W. Walt, USMC retired, as head of Special Task Force on the World Drug Situation, stated that Southeast Asia is providing 10 or 15 percent of the total drug traffic coming into this country. Because of its tremendous potential, however, Southeast Asia could eventually replace Turkey as the largest producer of opium in Asia with approximately 400 tons. Laos, however, accounted for nearly 100 tons, and Thailand for almost 200 tons annually. According to the State Department, heroin imports from Southeast Asia's "golden triangle" to the United States doubled from 1969 to 1971. These countries not only produce opium, but are the homes for many of the laboratories which convert opium into the more valuable and much deadlier commodity—heroin.

General Walt went on to say that,

We know as a certainty that a lot of opium entering the illicit market is grown in the "golden triangle," or in Turkey, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Mexico.

The Turkish Government has taken decisive action in banning all opium production after 1972. This should effectively dry up Turkish sources. Mexico is the source of approximately 10 percent of the heroin smuggled into the United States and is the route of transit of 15 percent. The Mexican Government has established penalties under the agrarian reform law for those who plant or permit the planting of opium. Penalties include confiscation of land and livestock. In addition, they have mobilized 10,000

troops for antidrug operations, destroying more than 2,500 hectares of poppy fields.

Mr. President, Michel Lamberti, co-author of a book on heroin, has written:

Any underdeveloped country with a large unemployed labor force can start production. This could be the case, say for various South American countries.

If we are to deter these underdeveloped countries from realizing their potential as opium producers and distributors, we must act boldly and decisively. Some have suggested paying subsidies to those foreign farmers who agree not to grow opium as we have done in Turkey. But from the Washington Post of February 18, 1973,

American financial contributions to Turkey as part of the considerable political pressure to stop the cultivation of the opium poppy after 1972, offers no encouragement to other opium producing countries. Turkish authorities had estimated that stopping opium production would cost the country 432 million dollars; United States contributions have amounted to 35 million dollars.

Obviously, the cost of such subsidies to fully pay for opium produced in all countries would become extreme. Threats to begin production by those countries not now engaged might also become commonplace. We would be paying a tribute to tyranny—the tyranny of drug traffickers. The only practical and honorable deterrent to illicit opium production and sales is the imposition of penalties on those nations which refuse to cooperate. And the only penalty we can impose on a sovereign nation is the removal of American assistance. This line of reasoning was accepted by Congress when it gave the power of suspending foreign aid to countries not taking adequate steps to end illicit drug traffic to the President last year. By enacting the pending amendment, we will be serving notice to organized crime and governments which have not taken vigorous action against drug traffic that we will no longer tolerate the financial human or social costs that illicit drugs have brought to our people.

Let me explain what my amendment does. Under my proposal, the President shall annually make an affirmative finding that a country is taking adequate steps to control the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives. The affirmative finding shall be submitted to the Congress, which may by concurrent resolution reject the finding as to any country. All foreign assistance will then be suspended to that country.

My proposal calls upon the Secretary of State to set forth those measures which constitute a good faith effort to control illicit opium and its derivatives. Those measures may reflect the individuality of the country, but shall include:

First. The enactment of criminal laws controlling the production, distribution, transportation, and manufacture of opium and its derivatives;

Second. The establishment of a viable agency to enforce those criminal laws;

Third. The vigorous enforcement of those criminal laws;

Fourth. The full cooperation of such country with all U.S. departments and

agencies involved in the interdiction of the supply of illicit opium and its derivatives into the United States;

Fifth. The establishment of border procedures for the interdiction of opium and its derivatives, out of or into such country;

Sixth. The destruction of all illicit opium and its derivatives after its evidentiary use has expired; and

Seventh. The establishment of detailed procedures for the control of all legal production, transportation, distribution or manufacture of opium and its derivatives.

I have modified my amendment to clarify a questionable interpretation of when foreign assistance is to be suspended to each country not taking adequate steps to control illicit opium. Under my amendment as modified, subsection (c) of section 481 will read:

(c) The President (or his delegate) shall cause to be suspended all foreign assistance, tangible or intangible, including but not limited to gifts, loans, credit sales, or guarantees to each country, except as provided in (b) of this section, when such aid is rejected by the Congress in accordance with subsection (b) of section 482 of this chapter.

This clarifies my amendment, and makes it clear that no aid will be suspended to any country under my amendment unless Congress by concurrent resolution rejects the President's finding of fact that adequate steps are being taken to control illicit opium.

My amendment does not cut off assistance to any country, but will result in a studied effort to determine which countries are seriously attempting to control the illicit flow of narcotics.

Further, Mr. President, I would like to explain the technical changes of my amendment to the existing law. I believe that once my colleagues understand the legal ramifications of my amendment, they will support it as a clear expression of the intent of Congress to the administration of this country in the conduct of their foreign policy.

Section 481 will be divided into subsections. The first subsection expresses the sense of Congress to be full and effective international cooperation to end the illicit production, smuggling, trafficking in, and abuse of dangerous drugs.

The second subsection will begin with the second sentence and authorizes the President to conclude agreements with other countries to facilitate the control of production, processing, transportation and distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

My amendment then strikes the remainder of section 481, which states:

The President shall suspend economic and military assistance furnished under this or any other act, and shall suspend sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take adequate steps to prevent narcotic drugs and other controlled substances (as defined by the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country, or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government personnel or their de-

pendents or from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the government of such country has taken adequate steps to carry out the purposes of this chapter," and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

(c) The President (or his delegate) shall cause to be suspended all foreign assistance, tangible or intangible, including but not limited to gifts, loans, credit sales, or guarantees to every country, except as provided in (b)—(which is the provision of aid to countries for the control of illicit substances) of this section and section 482 of this chapter.

My proposal then inserts a new section 482 which calls upon the President to make an affirmative finding that a country is taking adequate steps to control the production, distribution, transportation and manufacture of opium and its derivatives within 90 days of the enactment of this bill, and each year thereafter, which finding will be submitted to the Congress the first day of June of each year.

The Congress may then adopt a concurrent resolution rejecting the President's findings as to any or all countries, whereupon the President shall immediately suspend all foreign assistance to such country designated by the concurrent resolution. This establishes a partnership between the President and Congress which will allow for the Congress to perform their constitutional oversight responsibility, and set forth to the countries engaged in illicit opium trade that the U.S. Government will no longer support their government while they condone conduct denigrating to the United States.

For several years, I have been actively seeking legislation which would reduce the flow of narcotics into the United States. I am again introducing an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which clarifies the posture of the U.S. Government in international narcotics control. A similar amendment was passed by the Senate last year.

Mr. President, my proposal does not engage in foreign policy, but merely sets forth the intent of Congress to the President that unless countries are as concerned about the illicit flow of narcotics as is the United States, this country should not support their endeavors while they bankrupt the fabric of America.

My amendment is not a cure-all for the drug problem in the United States. It is a positive beginning by the Congress to tell the world and the administration that we are tired of rhetoric. And it tells addicts that we care and want to help.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the Senator and with the ranking minority member, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

While section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act presently requires the President to cut off aid to any country which does not take effective steps to control international traffic in narcotics, the amendment is a sound amendment. I understand that the Senator's amendment tightens up that section and requires affirmative action on the part of the President.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

It makes sure that the President will take affirmative action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is an amendment that is more than acceptable. It gets at a very tough problem on the narcotics scene. It strengthens the hands of the President at home in enforcing narcotic legislation.

If the Senator would yield back the remainder of his time, I would be glad to yield back the time on this side and accept the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I learned long ago that whenever there is a spirit of cooperation on the other side, one should not push his luck.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I thank the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Indiana (putting the question).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the manager of the bill for accepting the amendment. I think that this is action of which he will be extremely proud.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The hour of 1:45 p.m. having arrived, pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the first Church amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.
Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is detained on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 450 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Abourezk	Burdick	Chiles
Allen	Byrd	Church
Bentsen	Harry F., Jr.	Clark
Bible	Byrd, Robert C.	Cranston
Biden	Cannon	Eagleton

Eastland
Ervin
Fulbright
Gravel
Gurney
Hartke
Haskell
Hathfield
Helms
Hollings
Huddleston

Hughes
Johnston
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McClure
McGovern
McIntyre
Montoya
Nelson

Nunn
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Schweiker
Scott,
William L.
Symington
Talmadge
Montoya
Weicker

NAYS—47

Aiken
Baker
Bartlett
Beall
Bellmon
Bennett
Brock
Brooke
Buckley
Case
Cook
Cotton
Curtis
Domenici
Dominick
Fannin

Fong
Griffin
Hansen
Hart
Hathaway
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Kennedy
Mathias
Metcalf
Mondale
Muskie
Packwood

Percy
Ribicoff
Roth
Saxbe
Scott, Hugh
Sparkman
Stafford
Stevens
Stevenson
Taft
Thurmond
Tower
Tunney
Williams
Young

NOT VOTING—7

Bayh
Dole
Goldwater

McGee
Moss
Pearson

Stennis

So Mr. CHURCH's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Idaho, having voted in the affirmative, and the affirmatives having lost, he is not in a position to move to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). The Senator from Idaho, not having voted on the prevailing side, is not eligible to make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us proceed with the next vote.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I change my vote to "no" and move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the vote has been announced. I make the point of order that the vote has been announced and that the motion is therefore not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is correct.

The question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the second amendment of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH).

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the

Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is detained on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 451 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Abourezk
Allen
Baker
Bartlett
Bentsen
Bible
Biden
Brock
Buckley
Burdick
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.

Eagleton
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gravel
Gurney
Hansen
Hartke
Haskell
Hathfield
Helms
Hollings
Hruska
Huddleston
Hughes
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Long
Magnuson
Mansfield
Mathias
McClellan

McClure
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Nelson
Nunn
Packwood
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Roth
Saxbe
Schweiker
Scott,
William L.

Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Case
Chiles
Church
Clark
Cook
Cotton
Cranston
Curtis
Domenici
Dominick

Stevens
Stevenson
Taft
Thurmond
Tower
Tunney
Williams
Young

NAYS—25

Aiken
Beall
Bellmon
Bennett
Brooke
Fong
Griffin
Hart
Hathaway

Humphrey
Javits
Kennedy
Muskie
Percy
Ribicoff
Scott, Hugh
Sparkman
Stafford

Stevens
Stevenson
Taft
Thurmond
Tower
Tunney
Williams

NOT VOTING—7

Bayh
Dole
Goldwater

McGee
Moss
Pearson

Stennis

So Mr. CHURCH's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider en bloc the votes by which the last two amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, what is the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is to reconsider en bloc the votes by which the last two amendments were agreed to.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Heiting, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. BARTLETT) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

S 18388

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 2, 1973

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Naoyo Campbell;

S. 89. An act for the relief of Kuay Ten Chang (Kuay Hong Chang); and

S. 396. An act for the relief of Harold C. and Vetra L. Adler, doing business as the Adler Construction Co.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 795) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 321) providing for adjournment of the House from Thursday, October 4, 1973, to Tuesday, October 9, 1973, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 235) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 567

Mr. FULERIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 567.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. FULERIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1973".

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

Sec. 2. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 202(a), relating to authorization—

(A) immediately after "fiscal year 1972," strike out "and";

(B) immediately after "fiscal year 1973," insert "\$125,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975,";

(C) immediately after "June 30, 1972," strike out "and"; and

(D) immediately after "June 30, 1973," insert "June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975,".

(2) In section 203, relating to fiscal provisions, strike out "for the fiscal year 1970, for the fiscal year 1971, for the fiscal year 1972, and the fiscal year 1973" and insert in lieu thereof "for the fiscal years 1974 and 1975".

TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

Sec. 3. Title I of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 211(a), relating to general authority, in the last sentence immediately after the word "assistance", insert the word "directly".

(2) In section 212, relating to authorization, strike out "\$175,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972, and \$175,000,000 for the fiscal year 1973" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975".

(3) Section 214, relating to American schools and hospitals abroad, is amended by striking out subsections (c) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) To carry out the purposes of this section there are authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1974, \$19,000,000, which amount is authorized to remain available until expended.

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for fiscal year 1974, \$6,500,000 in foreign currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

"(e) On or before the termination of thirty days after the convening of the second regular session of the Ninety-third Congress, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Congress, for consideration in connection with Department of State authorization legislation, such recommendations as he considers desirable for assistance to schools, libraries, and hospital centers for medical education and research, outside the United States, founded, or sponsored by United States citizens and serving on study and demonstration centers for ideas and practices of the United States."

HOUSING GUARANTIES

Sec. 4. Title III of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 221, relating to worldwide housing guarantees, strike out "\$205,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$349,900,000".

(2) In section 223(1), relating to general provisions, strike out "June 30, 1974" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1975".

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Sec. 5. Section 252 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a)—

(A) strike out "for the fiscal year 1972, \$295,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1973, \$295,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$150,000,000"; and

(B) strike out "\$88,500,000 for each such fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000 for each such fiscal year".

(2) Strike out subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$900,000 for grants to the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance, Incorporated."

PROGRAMS RELATING TO POPULATION GROWTH

Sec. 6. Section 292 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "1972 and 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "1974 and 1975".

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

Sec. 7. Section 302 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), relating to authorization, strike out "for the fiscal year 1972,

\$138,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1973, \$138,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$120,000,000".

(2) Subsection (b)(2), relating to Indus Basin Development grants, strike out "for use in the fiscal year 1972, \$15,000,000, and for use in the fiscal year 1973, \$15,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for use in each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$14,000,000".

CONTINGENCY FUND

Sec. 8. Section 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1972 not to exceed \$30,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1973 not to exceed \$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, not to exceed \$23,500,000".

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

Sec. 9. Section 482 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "\$42,500,000 for the fiscal year 1973, which amount is" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$40,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, and \$30,500,000 for the fiscal year 1975, which amounts are".

PROHIBITIONS AGAINST FURNISHING ASSISTANCE

Sec. 10. The first full paragraph of section 620(e)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof "the provisions of this subsection shall not be waived with respect to any country unless the President determines and certifies that such a waiver is important to the national interests of the United States. Such certification shall be reported immediately to Congress."

EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONNEL

Sec. 11. Section 625 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k)(1) In accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe, the following categories of personnel who serve in the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act shall become participants in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System:

"(A) a person serving under unlimited appointments in employment subject to subsection (d)(2) of this section as Foreign Service Reserve officers and as Foreign Service staff officers and employees; and

"(B) a person serving in a position to which he was appointed by the President, whether with or without the advice and consent of the Senate, if (1) such person shall have served previously under an unlimited appointment pursuant to such subsection (d)(2) or a comparable provision of predecessor legislation to this Act, and (2) following service specified in clause (1) of this subparagraph, such person shall have served continuously with such agency of its predecessor agencies only in positions established under the authority of sections 624(a) and 631(b) or comparable provisions of predecessor legislation to this Act.

"(2) Upon becoming a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, any such officer or employee shall make a special contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund in accordance with the provisions of section 852 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. Thereafter, compulsory contributions will be made with respect to each such participating officer or employee in accordance with the provisions of section 811 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"(3) The provisions of section 636 and title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as

October 2, 1973

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600170002-0
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 18389

amended, shall apply to participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System by any such officer or employee.

"(4) If an officer who becomes a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, to a position in any agency of the United States Government, any United States delegation or mission to any international organization, in any international commission, or in any international body, such officer shall not, by virtue of the acceptance of such an appointment, lose his status as a participant in the system.

"(5) Any such officer or employee who becomes a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be mandatorily retired (A) at the end of the month in which he reaches age seventy, or (B) earlier if, during the third year after the effective date of this subsection, he attains age sixty-four or if he is over age sixty-four; during the fourth year at age sixty-three; during the fifth year at age sixty-two; during the sixth year at age sixty-one; and thereafter at the end of the month in which he reaches age sixty. However, no participant shall be mandatorily retired under this paragraph while serving in a position to which appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Any participant who completes a period of authorized service after reaching the mandatory retirement age specified in this paragraph shall be retired at the end of the month in which such service is completed.

"(6) Whenever the President deems it to be in the public interest, he may extend any participant's service for a period not to exceed five years after mandatory retirement date of such officer or employee.

"(7) This subsection shall become effective on the first day of the first which begins more than one year after the date of its enactment, except that any officer or employee who, before such effective date, meets the requirements for participation in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System under paragraph (1) of this subsection may elect to become a participant before the effective date of this subsection. Such officer or employee shall become a participant on the first day of the second month following the date of his application for earlier participation. Any officer or employee who becomes a participant in the system under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, who is age fifty-seven or over on the effective date of this subsection may retire voluntarily at any time before mandatory retirement under paragraph (5) of this subsection and receive retirement benefits under section 821 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"(8) Any officer or employee who is separated for cause while a participant in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System pursuant to this subsection shall be entitled to benefits in accordance with section 637 (b) and (d) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. The provisions of subsection (e) of this section shall apply to participants in lieu of the provisions of sections 633 and 634 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended."

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 12. Section 637(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorizations, is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1972, \$50,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1973, \$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975, \$49,000,000".

GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 659. SHARING OF COSTS.—No assistance shall be furnished by the United States Government to a country under title I, II, or VI of chapter 2 of part I of this Act until the country provides assurances to the President, and the President is satisfied, that such country will provide at least 25 per centum of the costs in any fiscal year of the entire program, project, or activity with respect to which such assistance is to be furnished, except that such costs borne by such country may be provided on an 'in-kind' basis.

"SEC. 660. MULTILATERAL APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT.—Greater efforts should be made to promote and support sound multilateral approaches to the development of foreign countries. Therefore, the Secretary of State shall undertake consultations with multilateral organizations (including the United Nations) for the purpose of determining (1) how soon and which such multilateral organizations would be able to administer foreign assistance funds transferred to them by the United States Government for programs, projects, and activities for the development of foreign countries, (2) the kinds of such programs, projects, and activities which those organizations are able and will be able to administer, (3) likely methods for the administration of those programs, projects, and activities, and (4) the expectation of increased contributions by other countries to such organizations for those programs, projects, and activities. Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall make a report to the President and the Congress with respect to his consultations, including such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

"SEC. 661. PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING.—No part of any appropriation made available to carry out this or any other provision of law shall be used to conduct any police training or related program for a foreign country."

POSTWAR RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, AND LAOS

SEC. 14. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART V—POSTWAR RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, AND LAOS

"SEC. 801. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to furnish, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, assistance for relief and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, including humanitarian assistance to refugees, civilian war casualties, and other persons disadvantaged by hostilities or conditions related to those hostilities in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

"SEC. 802. AUTHORIZATION.—There authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$376,000,000, which amount is authorized to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 803. ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE CHILDREN.—(a) It is the sense of Congress that inadequate provision has been made (1) for the establishment, expansion, and improvement of day care centers, orphanages, hostels, school feeding programs, health and welfare programs, and training related to these programs, which are designed for the benefit of South Vietnamese children, disadvantaged by hostilities in Vietnam or conditions related to those hostilities, and (2) for the adoption by United States citizens of South Vietnamese children, who are orphaned or abandoned, or whose parents or sole surviving parent, as the case may be, has irrevocably relinquished all parental rights.

"(b) The President is therefore authorized to provide assistance, on terms and conditions he considers appropriate, for the purposes described in subsection (a) of this sec-

tion. Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 802 of this Act for the fiscal year 1974, \$7,500,000 shall be available until expended solely to carry out the purposes described in such subsection (a). Not more than 10 per centum of the funds made available to carry out such subsection (a) may be expended for the purposes referred to in clause (2) of such subsection. Assistance to carry out the purposes referred to in such subsection (a) shall be furnished, to the maximum extent practicable, under the auspices of and by international agencies or United States or South Vietnamese voluntary agencies.

"SEC. 804. CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER LAWS.—All references to part I of this Act, whether heretofore or hereafter enacted, shall be deemed to be references also to this part unless otherwise specifically provided. The authorities available to administer part I of this Act shall be available to administer programs authorized in this part. The provisions of section 655(c) of this Act shall not apply with respect to funds made available for fiscal year 1974 under part I, this part, and section 637 of this Act."

TERMINATION OF INDOCHINA WAR

SEC. 15. No funds authorized or appropriated under this or any other law may be expended to finance military or paramilitary operations by the United States in or over Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 16. No funds authorized or appropriated under any provision of law shall be made available for the purpose of financing directly or indirectly any military or paramilitary operations by foreign forces in Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, or Thailand unless (1) such operations are conducted by the forces of the government receiving such funds within the borders of that country, or (2) specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

WEST AFRICAN FAMINES

SEC. 17. In regard to the famine in West Africa, the President shall consult with international relief organizations and other experts to find the best way to forestall future famine conditions in West Africa, and he shall report to Congress as soon as possible on solutions to this problem of famine and further propose how any of these solutions may be carried out by multilateral organizations.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

SEC. 18. It is the sense of Congress that the President should deny any economic or military assistance to the government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes.

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE IN INDOCHINA

SEC. 19. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the Agreements on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam, and protocols thereto, signed in Paris, France, on January 27, 1973, will be effective only to the extent that the parties to such agreements and protocols carry out the letter as well as the spirit of those agreements and protocols. It is further the sense of Congress that the United States should not furnish economic or military assistance to any such party, or make any sale, credit sale, or guaranty to or on behalf of any such party, unless that party agrees to comply, and does comply, with those agreements and protocols.

(b) This section shall not apply to the provision of food and other humanitarian assistance which is administered and distributed, under international auspices or by United States voluntary agencies, directly to persons and not through any government.

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

SEC. 20. (a) After the expiration of any thirty-five-day period which begins on the

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600170002-0

date the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives has delivered to the office of the head of the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ACTION, or the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, a written request that it be furnished any document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material in its custody or control relating to such department, agency, or corporation, none of the funds made available to such department, agency, or corporation, shall be obligated unless and until there has been furnished to the committee making the request the document, paper, communication, audit, review, finding, recommendation, report, or other material so requested.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to any communication that is directed by the President to a particular officer or employee of any such department, agency, or corporation or to any communication that is directed by any such officer or employee to the President.

(c) Section 634(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(1)"; and

(2) by striking out all after the phrase "so requested" and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any communication that is directed by the President to a particular officer or employee of the United States Government or to any communication that is directed by any such officer or employee to the President."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, what is the time situation with respect to this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 hour.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, this is an amendment in the nature of a substitute. It would continue the foreign aid program under the traditional authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as recommended by the administration earlier this year, and make a modest reduction of \$217 million in the overall amount recommended by the committee. It also includes all of the provisions now in S. 2335 that were initiated in the Foreign Relations Committee. It is the same bill except for deletion of the new authorization categories and the reduction in amounts.

I urge the adoption of this substitute for two principal reasons: First, the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee is merely a cosmetic job designed to give a facelifting to the foreign aid program, but which leaves the basic policy unchanged. Second, the state of our economy and the Government's fiscal condition are such that we cannot afford the luxury of continuing to spend the massive amounts recommended in this bill for a bilateral foreign aid program which is badly in need of basic change.

The bill is both deceptive and defective. For years bilateral economic aid, other than that for straight budget support, as has been the case in Indochina, has been approved by Congress in two major categories: Development loans and grants for technical assistance. These funds were then loaned or given to recipient countries for the various projects and activities—in the fields of agricul-

ture, health, population, education, industrial development, transportation, and so on—that had been justified to Congress.

This year the Agency for International Development—AID—argued within the executive branch that its program would have a better chance to survive the gauntlet of an increasingly skeptical Congress if it asked for money in categories which had more sales appeal. Instead of the traditional loan and grant categories, it wanted to ask Congress for money under these labels: First, food production, nutrition, and rural development; second, population planning and health; third, education and human resource development; fourth, selected development problems; and fifth, selected countries and organizations. But the Office of Management and Budget did not accept that plan and the executive branch's foreign aid submission to Congress ended up as a straightforward extension of the existing loan and grant authority. This bill contains the same authorization categories sought by AID and rejected within the executive branch. Thus, it is, in effect, AID's second attempt to obtain a legislative revamping of its image.

Senators should not be deceived. The foreign aid program will not be changed by this bill; even the authorization labels are the same as those in the AID congressional presentation book. The people who will administer the program will be the same as now. And they will be dispensing \$1.2 billion for the same projects and programs AID has supported in the past. This is hardly the "vigorous new initiative" claimed for this measure by its principal sponsor.

By authorizing amounts for five specific aid categories, it appears, on the surface, that congressional control will be strengthened under this bill. This is but a bit of legislative sleight of hand. The bill authorizes \$592 million this fiscal year for five categories.

Let us look at how this new system will work. Take, for example, the category of "Selected Countries and Organizations," for which the bill authorizes \$28 million. Among other things this money is to be used for "support of the general economy of recipient countries," in plain English, a program to finance imports. By adding loan reflows, the money available for "Selected Countries and Organizations" this fiscal year can be increased to \$122 million—four times the specific amount the Senate is being asked to approve in this bill.

Here is another example of how this bill weakens Congress control over foreign aid spending. Under existing law Congress authorizes and appropriates specific amounts for loans and specific amounts for grants. But not under this bill. It authorizes a lump sum for each of the five categories, money which can be used for either loans or grants. The only requirement is that not more than half of the new funds appropriated for all categories can be used as grants. Executive branch bureaucrats, not Congress, will be the ones to decide how much in each category is given out as grants and how much in loans. They could require that population activities be financed en-

tirely on a loan basis while financing the building of dams and steel mills with grants, if they choose to do so. The bill is so loosely drawn that the assistance authorized in the new categories could be used here in the United States, not in the poor countries, as intended.

The bill states only that the "President is authorized to furnish assistance on such terms and conditions as he may determine"—without specifying that the assistance is to go to foreign countries. It is another example of why this bill should be put aside for further study and refinement. For years Congress has been trying to plug the many loopholes in the foreign aid program. This bill reverses that commendable record.

If the Senate adopts S. 2335, it will probably do so under the impression that it is voting to make significant changes in the foreign aid program. This would be an illusion which would result only in giving the existing unsatisfactory aid program a new lease on life. This bill does not represent a change of policy; it is "business as usual." The foreign aid program needs a drastic overhaul, not a facelifting. My substitute would continue the existing programs, at a slightly reduced level, to give an opportunity for Congress to make an in-depth study of the entire spectrum of U.S. relations with the poor countries of the world. It would avoid shoving the foreign aid problem under the rug.

As to the amounts, my substitute would authorize a total of \$1 billion compared with the \$1.2 billion recommended by the committee, a reduction of \$217 million. The reductions would be made primarily in the development loan category and, to a lesser extent, the technical assistance program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a comparative table of the amounts involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this bill cannot be considered in isolation from our general economic situation. Our economy is in a state of disarray, the Government's fiscal condition perilous. In the past 2 years we have seen the end of the convertibility of the dollar into gold and two devaluations of the dollar—by 7.9 and 10 percent.

The disorder in our financial house is largely due to the accumulated effects of many years of over-commitment abroad, including the foreign aid program. Our Government's zealous determination to control and shape the destinies of much of the world has brought our Nation to a state of financial exhaustion. Since 1965 the Federal debt has increased by \$150 billion, interest on the national debt has doubled, and the cost of living is up by 40 percent. The \$50 billion balance-of-payments deficit our Nation has incurred over the last 3 years is directly related to over-commitment abroad and the lessening of world confidence in the United States' ability to put its house in order. The programs to be funded by this bill add over \$400 million annually to our balance-of-payments deficit. Enactment of this bill will contribute further to the

deterioration of our general economic position.

Mr. President, 3 years ago AID completed a swanky hotel and apartment complex in New Delhi for foreign aid personnel at a cost of \$3.2 million. Not long ago it was turned over to the Indian Government as a consequence of the shutdown of most of the U.S. aid program following the India-Pakistan war. Now, according to press accounts, India cannot figure out what to do with this costly white elephant. This is an appropriate symbol of the foreign aid program.

On a related issue, the September 20 Washington Post reported that India had proposed, and the United States had tentatively agreed, to settle its \$3 billion foreign currency debt to us for \$100 million in dollars and \$900 million in local currency. Although, on the surface, it appears that only two-thirds of the rupee debt was written off, the American taxpayer has lost much more since, apparently, much of the \$900 million in rupees will be used in foreign aid programs in the region.

I do not criticize this settlement as such, but for what it represents—the culmination of a misguided foreign aid policy. An Indian economist wrote in the New York Times recently:

Better Indo-U.S. relations can only be built on a "zero aid" position. . . . The overwhelming majority of the Indian people . . . are against foreign aid.

Now that the Indian foreign currency debt is being settled on such a favorable basis for India, we can expect Pakistan to demand equal treatment on the \$1.1 billion in foreign currency she owes on Public Law 480 purchases. And the list of petitioners is likely to grow. Indeed, if the entire \$8.3 billion in outstanding Public Law 480 foreign currency debts were settled on this basis, the American taxpayer would end up getting only about \$280 million in dollars and \$2.5 billion in foreign currency. And, with the debt burdens of the poor countries growing, it is not unreasonable to expect similar defaults in the future on the \$29 billion outstanding in dollar repayable loans. Settlement on the one-third basis followed in India would cost the taxpayers an additional \$20 billion.

One final point. The \$1 billion proposed in my substitute is but a small part of the overall foreign aid program for this fiscal year. The total foreign aid package proposed by the executive branch comes to \$7.9 billion, using the most conservative estimates. Other estimates go as high as \$8.6 billion. There is now \$2.7 billion in the pipeline for the programs to be authorized by this bill. If no new program money at all were provided by Congress the foreign aid program would still continue for the indefinite future. In view of our Government's fiscal situation I think a further modest reduction in foreign aid is well justified.

I urge the Senate to give priority consideration to restoring the confidence of our people in our ability to act responsibly in fiscal matters and to vote for my substitute.

Mr. President, I believe I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a table comparing the continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will read only the total amount. The continuing resolution we are now operating under has \$1,240.9 million. The committee recommendation in the bill before the Senate is \$1,234.4 million. My amendment would reduce that to \$1,017.1 million, or in other words \$217 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks two articles describing the Indian settlement of its debt to the United States, published in The Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1973]
INDIA OFFERS SETTLEMENT OF DEBTS TO U.S.
(By Barry Schweid)

The Indian government has proposed—and the United States tentatively accepted—settling its \$3 billion debt for \$100 million in cash and \$900 million to be spent on U.S. operations in India and aid to neighboring countries.

Under terms of the proposal carried here from New Delhi by Ambassador Daniel P. Moynihan, the remaining \$2 billion debt would be used to underwrite agricultural development, rural electricity, housing and other Indian projects.

All but the \$100 million that India would give the United States in cash could remain in native currency—the rupee—under the proposal.

The debt has built up over the years from American grain supplied during the famine years of the 1960s under the Food for Peace program, and completed U.S. aid loans to India. Although the debt is equivalent to \$3 billion, it is actually owed to America by India in terms of rupees, not U.S. dollars.

Moynihan is in Washington to consult with Henry A. Kissinger, the Secretary of State-designate, and other top officials. He still is considering an offer of a top post in the department, but appears inclined to pass it up before returning to New Delhi next weekend.

The 46-year-old Democrat has been ambassador only seven months. He is reluctant to drop the delicate job of repairing relations between the two countries, strained especially during the 1971 Indian war with Pakistan when Indians generally claimed that Washington was tilting toward their enemy.

The prospective compromise on the rupee account is essentially a political agreement, one that could help overcome Indian bitterness over the fact that Washington owns a handsome chunk of the Indian economy. The rupees have piled up in the Reserve Bank of India, drawing interest, despite vigorous U.S. efforts to spend them partly by such means as financing visits to India by American officials.

The \$100 million would be paid over the next 10 years. Part of the \$900 million in rupees would be used to finance U.S. aid programs to Nepal and other small countries on the subcontinent as well as to keep up the U.S. embassy and other American offices.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1973]
UNITED STATES TO END AID PROGRAM IN INDIA
(By Lewis M. Simons)

NEW DELHI, July 15.—In the next couple of days, as soon as Prime Minister Indira Gandhi gets over a case of flu, U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan will call on her and close out an era.

The ambassador will inform the prime

minister that the much-maligned U.S. aid program to India is officially ended, at her government's insistence, after 22 years and an expenditure of \$10 billion.

Moynihan will also present Mrs. Gandhi with a proposal for disposing of \$840 million in Indian rupees held by the United States as a result of Indian payments for American grain supplied during the famine years of the 1960s under the Food for Peace program.

Finally, Moynihan will turn over to the prime minister a \$6 million complex of luxury buildings occupied by the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) in New Delhi. The complex was completed just two years ago.

So far as the Indians are concerned, the most important of the three components of the package will be Moynihan's proposition regarding the U.S. rupee holdings.

These rupees are held in the Reserve Bank of India and they represent a drain on the Indian economy because of the enormous interest the account commands—interest that is piling up faster than the rupees themselves can possibly be spent.

The ambassador, who recently returned from consultations with President Nixon, refuses to reveal details of the plan until he has seen Mrs. Gandhi. He said only that the proposal falls "somewhere between zero and infinity." In other words, it will not insist that the mammoth account remain in the Indian bank, nor will it write off the entire matter, as the Indians would like.

Sources familiar with the proposal say it is a good one, from India's viewpoint, and that Mrs. Gandhi is likely to accept it. Her only reason for rejecting it, the sources speculate, would be political, not economic.

The prime minister and members of her government periodically trot out the "rupee problem" when they want to accuse the United States of worming its way into the Indian economy. But the United States may not spend any of its rupee holdings without India's express consent.

Moynihan hopes his plan will be the first important step toward putting Indian-American relations on a normal nation-to-nation basis.

As much as ideological variants and military alliances, the donor-debtor relationship has helped sour India on the United States and vice versa.

The prime minister's attitude makes clear that there is no point to the old kind of relationship for either side. Knowing this, Moynihan is eager to clear the decks before his stewardship moves into full gear.

He views the transfer of the U.S. AID complex of buildings to the government of India as symbolizing an end to one era and the start of another.

The collection of white brick buildings sticks up from the desert on the south edge of New Delhi like a sore thumb. And like a sore thumb, it has been an irritant ever since it was built.

The south block complex as it is known to AID staff members, was living proof that the United States owned more of India's rupees than was good for either country.

The decision to build the complex with food for peace rupees, was made in 1969, when AID had 260 Americans working in India and the United States was spending what was considered "funny money" on anything it could think of, just to get rid of some of it.

As one AID insider put it, "The way we were buying and spending in those days would make your hair curl. Anything anybody wanted was okay."

The south block concept fit in perfectly with that kind of mentality. After all, the reasoning went, India is a hard place for Americans to live in. The weather is miserably hot at least half of the year, and all year-round in some parts; You cannot drink the water without boiling it; you cannot buy

a steak; outside the big cities there's no place to swim, etc., etc. In short, wouldn't it be nice to have a place where we could get away from India, even for just a little while.

The south block is just such a place, "An ostentatious American ghetto, but the best damned oasis in the Indian desert," as one AID staffer put it. The complex consists of a clustered six-story building containing 30 roomy two- and three-bedroom apartments; a hotel with 13 double rooms as well as a dining room, cocktail lounge, reception room, library, four-lane bowling alley and swimming pool. The whole thing is swathed in tinted glass, lined with wall-to-wall carpeting, cooled with central air conditioning, sweetened with piped-in stereo music and lubricated with pure drinking water right from the taps.

In addition to these living and playing facilities, the complex has a sprawling, low-slung office block, a giant warehouse and a covered garage. These buildings have already been turned over to India which has installed members of its science and technology ministry in them.

The rest of the buildings will be turned over by the end of September. Such a transfer was envisaged in 1969. The agreement signed by AID and the Indian government then said India would receive the complex "when no longer required for the support of the United States assistance program in India."

Barely a year after the construction ended, Mrs. Ghandi said India had had enough of U.S. AID and the staff was quickly run down to its present 12 Americans.

A major unknown is how the Indian government is going to cope with the huge cost and expertise needed to run the modern complex. Electricity alone costs \$67,000 a year. Total annual operating costs are \$160,000.

An American engineer who just completed an overall inspection of the plumbing and water purification plant told AID staffers he expected the whole system would cease functioning six months after the Indians take over.

Cyril Peters, an Indian national who has been manager of the complex since its completion, says it will take even less time.

"The government won't be able to run it," said Peters. "I'd hate to see it three months after they move in. Under my management, everyone does whatever is required of him. The government will have to worry about caste. Higher caste people won't help with low-level jobs. It will be a mess."

The end of the south block complex does not mean that the American community in New Delhi will no longer have a refuge from India.

There is still the American Community Support Association, where Americans can taste such joys of home as hamburgers, hot dogs, American beer, cokes and soft ice cream and relax in the swimming pool and on the baseball diamond.

The handful of AID staffers and their families who will remain in New Delhi to oversee outstanding loans, the large school lunch program and a few other extant projects are being transferred to rented houses or embassy compound apartments.

Ironically, just as the south block is being given up, the U.S. embassy finds itself needing at least 20 new apartments for staff members. A 12-unit building was recently completed and plans for others are on the drawing boards.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Case Against Foreign Aid," which I think makes a very strong argument against the continuation of the program as it has been administered heretofore.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1972]

THE CASE AGAINST FOREIGN AID
(By Peter T. Bauer)

It can be confidently predicted that whatever the outcome of the election in November, foreign aid will once again be a controversial item on the agenda of Congress.

And it can also be predicted confidently that once again it will be alleged that official development assistance—that is, government-to-government grants or soft loans—is indispensable for the progress of poor countries.

Aid is given regardless of the conduct of the recipients, or of its results. It is virtually the only form of government expenditure which goes unquestioned, unlike defense, farm price supports or school lunch programs. This is remarkable.

Aid is plainly not necessary for development, as is shown by the progress of many poor countries without aid. Moreover, it is often damaging, because although it is admittedly an inflow of resources, it sets up repercussions which can outweigh the benefits.

Aid advocates often allege that official aid is indispensable for development. This offensively patronizes aid recipients by saying that they desperately want development but cannot achieve it without handouts—doles from us. In fact, very many poor countries have progressed without them. Malaya was transformed by the rise of the rubber industry, which received no external subsidies, from a sparsely populated country of hamlets in the 1890s to a thriving country by the 1930s where a much larger population lived longer at much higher standards.

AFRICA AND HONG KONG

To move from Asia to Africa, the Gold Coast (Ghana since 1957) was transformed between the 1880s and the 1950s without foreign aid. In 1880 there were no cocoa trees there; by 1950 there were huge exports of cocoa, all from African-owned farms. Again, in 1840 Hong Kong was a barren rock. By now four million people live in that major manufacturing center, whose competition is most embarrassing to Western industries. Hong Kong also developed without external gifts. And so did the now developed countries, all of which had begun as poor.

Official aid is thus not necessary for development. Nor is it sufficient. The Navajo Indian nation has remained wretchedly poor in spite of decades of huge American official aid. If a society cannot develop without external gifts, it will not develop with them. What holds back many less developed countries is the people who live there.

Development depends on people's capacities, motivations and social and political institutions. Where these basic determinants are favorable, material progress will usually occur. Materially ambitious, resourceful, industrious, far-sighted and thrifty people will create or obtain capital, and also use it productively.

There is an inescapable dilemma in the argument that aid is necessary for development. If the required conditions other than capital are present, capital will be generated locally or supplied commercially from abroad, to government or to business, so that aid is unnecessary for development. If the other conditions are not present, aid will be ineffective and thus useless.

It is often said that the culture and the social and political institutions of the recipients should not be disturbed. But what if these are incompatible with substantial material progress, as are many beliefs, customs and institutions, such as the deeply held belief in the sanctity of animal life in South Asia? Material progress requires moderniza-

tion of the mind, which is inhibited by many institutions in less developed countries and also by official policies pursued there.

Progress does not depend on handouts, but on capacities, mores and institutions. This still leaves open the question whether aid is more likely to promote or to retard progress, which cannot be shown so conclusively. I believe that in practice it is more likely to retard it. Here are some of the many reasons why.

Aid reinforces the disastrous tendency to make everything a matter of politics in less developed countries. The handouts increase the resources and power of governments compared to the rest of society, a result reinforced by the preferential treatment of governments which try to establish state-controlled economies and of countries with balance of payments problems. Politicization of life diverts energy and ambition from economic activity. Moreover it provokes and exacerbates political tension, because it becomes supremely important, often a matter of life and death, who has the government, as is clear from the recent history of Indonesia, Pakistan, East Africa and Nigeria.

Aid often supports most damaging policies. Many recipient governments restrict the activities of minorities, of Chinese in Indonesia, Asians in East and Central Africa, Indians in Burma, Europeans everywhere. The removal of thousands of Asians from East Africa (the most familiar of many examples) has reduced incomes and widened income differences between these countries and the West. These measures are often followed by the expulsion of even destruction of thousands or tens of thousands of people.

ENCOURAGING THE PARADOXICAL

Aid in many ways encourages the paradoxical policy of recipients to restrict the inflow and deployment of private capital. The Indian government, an aid recipient for many years, sets up expensive state oil refineries when the oil companies in India have unused capacity which they are not allowed to employ.

Foreign aid promotes the adoption of unsuitable external models. The establishment of uneconomic heavy industries and national airlines is familiar. More important is the proliferation of Western-type universities, whose graduates cannot find employment, and of Western-style trade unions which are only vehicles for the self-advancement of politicians.

Aid obscures the fact that progress cannot be had for nothing, that the peoples of advanced countries have themselves had to develop the required conditions. It reinforces a widespread attitude that opportunities and resources for the advance of one's self and one's family must be provided by someone else, which promotes or reinforces torpor, fatalism or even beggary and blackmail, but not self-improvement. Preoccupation with aid also diverts the government's attention from the basic causes of poverty and from the possibilities of acting on them.

These are just five ways in which an inflow of resources can damage development. And the economic productivity of aid resources is generally likely to be low and insufficient to outweigh the adverse repercussions. Aid cannot be so closely adjusted to local conditions as can resources supplied commercially. Moreover, governments are understandably apt to use resources donated from abroad on wasteful show projects.

All this is not to say that aid cannot promote development. Whether it in fact does so or not depends on the specific circumstances of each case. But the examples above make it clear that it is unwarranted to assume that because aid represents an inflow of resources, it must promote development. In fact, aid is at least as likely to retard development as to promote it.

If it is only money that were missing, it could be secured commercially from abroad.

Aid means at most that some capital is cheaper. But the capital is likely to be less productive than if it were supplied commercially from abroad to government or to business, and as we have seen, aid is also apt to set up far reaching adverse repercussions. There can, therefore, be no general presumption that in practice aid is more likely to promote development than to retard it. In fact, these various considerations suggest that as it has operated and is likely to operate, any general presumption would be the other way round. Of course, even if aid does promote development, this still leaves open the question why people in the donor countries should be taxed for this purpose.

It is often urged that the more aid is given the better, without examining its results that, somehow effectiveness is measured by cost, which no one in his senses would apply to his own life.

Aid certainly removes resources from the donors. But it does not follow that it promotes development. To make the rich poor, does not make the poor rich.

Once the case for aid is taken for granted, then either progress or its absence can be advanced for more aid; progress as evidence of its success, and lack of progress as evidence that more is needed. Whatever happens is an argument for more aid. When a case is taken for granted, evidence becomes irrelevant.

Why is the argument that aid is necessary so widely accepted if it is unfounded? This isn't strictly relevant; why people hold certain beliefs has nothing to do with their validity. However, for what it is worth let me give you my explanation.

Many advocates of aid are well intentioned, but not well informed. But by and large the aid crusade is a gigantic confidence trick. A well meaning public has been conned by a motley coalition which has succeeded in part by playing on feelings of guilt, which however unfounded are nevertheless widespread. I think this coalition includes international agencies and government departments anxious to increase their activities and power; professional humanitarians with similar ambitions; disillusioned, bored, power-and-money-hungry academics; the churches which face spiritual collapse and seek a role as welfare agencies; temperamental do-gooders, frustrated by events at home; politicians in search of publicity; exporters in search of easy markets, and governments embarrassed by commodity surpluses. And there are also many people who welcome any argument or policy which in some way or other weakens the position of Western society, which for various political and emotional reasons they have come to dislike.

Where do we go from here? What should we do about foreign aid? I think it would be best to finish this system of handouts which is bad for both the patrons and for the patronized, and which, by the way, is relatively recent and was started only some 20 years ago.

However, this is unlikely to come about, because of the emotional, political, intellectual, financial and administrative interests behind it. Moreover, the immense sums already spent on aid themselves operate against its termination: the greater are the sacrifices, the harder it is to question the principles in the name of which they have been extracted.

Given the fact that aid will continue, I would wish to see the method and criteria of allocation changed drastically. Aid could be allocated in such a manner that it would favor governments which within their human, administrative and financial resources try to perform the essential and difficult tasks of government and at the same time refrain from close control of the economy. These tasks include the successful conduct of external affairs; the maintenance of law and order; the effective management of the

monetary and fiscal system; the promotion of a suitable institutional framework for the activities of individuals; the provision of basic health and education services and of basic communications; and also agricultural extension work. These are important and essential functions which must devolve on the government. This is for two reasons. First, because part of the institutional structure within which the private sector functions does not emerge from the operation of market forces and so must be established by law. Second, because some of these activities yield services which, although there may be a demand for them, cannot be bought or sold in the market.

This list of tasks largely exhausts the potentialities of state action in the promotion of general living standards. These tasks are extensive and complex. Their adequate performance would fully stretch the resources of all governments in poor countries. Yet governments frequently neglect even the most elementary of these functions while attempting close control of the economies of their countries, or even, occasionally, contemplating coercive transformation of societies. They seem anxious to plan and unable to govern.

Much more thought could also be given to prevent the inflow of aid from biasing the development of recipient countries in directions based on inappropriate external prototypes. Preference could be given to governments interested more in improving the roads and extending external contacts than in opening Western-type universities or in creating heavy engineering works.

GOVERNING VS. PLANNING

The substantial revision of the criteria of allocation of aid which I suggest does not in the least imply underestimation of the tasks of government, but rather the reverse. The adoption of such criteria would favor governments which try to govern rather than to plan. By the same token, aid would be withheld from governments which pursue policies which plainly retard the material progress of their countries. And many of these policies, as for instance the maltreatment of economically successful minorities, often exacerbate the problems and difficulties both of other aid recipients and also of the donors.

The adoption of such criteria would promote relatively liberal economic systems in the recipient countries, minimize coercion and favor material progress, especially an improvement of living standards. It would also reduce political tension in the recipient countries.

This proposal assumes, of course, that the purpose of aid is to improve material conditions in recipient countries. But the proposal will be altogether unacceptable if the actual purpose of aid differs from the ostensible objective of improving general living standards in the recipient countries. It will be unacceptable if the primary purpose is the pursuit of unacknowledged political policies, such as the promotion of closely controlled economies and societies, or the increase in the resources and power of the international organizations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, lastly, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Foreign Aid Without Aid," published in the Washington Post on June 3, 1973.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1973]

FOREIGN AID WITHOUT AID

(By William C. Paddock)

The American bald eagle is a remarkable bird. For 83 days the parents feed their young. Then, realizing that the eaglets will

never fly without drastic action, the parents fly overhead with a fish, land nearby in sight—but out of reach—of the eaglets and eat the fish themselves. The eaglets are finally starved into leaving the safety of the nest to go out and fish for themselves.

It is a practice we would do well to keep in mind in pondering our foreign economic aid program, run by the Agency for International Development, which expires this month unless Congress, as it has in the past, grudgingly renews it.

For more than 25 years, the American people have been carrying out a sometimes charitable and sometimes self-serving crusade against hunger and poverty in the developing world. The crusade employs thousands of Americans overseas and has cost us more than \$150 billion. While the majority of those who have studied this crusade are hard put to find concrete proof that the money has been well spent, most internationally minded Americans still advocate a continued flow of such aid. But the time has come to let the developing world fish for itself.

A PREPOSTEROUS PROMISE

For more than 25 years the hungry nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America have heard of the miracles that American technical know-how, Yankee ingenuity and U.S. dollars can produce in a backward, hungry, tradition-bound nation. It is not surprising that these hungry nations have come to place a degree of faith for solving their problems on U.S. help.

No better example of this can be found than in the "green revolution," a name coined by a former AID head. The "wonder" wheat and "miracle" rice developed by the Rockefeller Foundation were "seeds of change" which gave Congress hope that the war on hunger not only could be won but was truly being won. The developing nations believed these florid statements.

Thus, after a couple of good crop years those countries credited their increased yields to new technology rather than to good rainfall. By 1970 Indonesia, the Philippines, Pakistan, India and others were talking confidently about soon being self-sufficient in food. The chairman of the Nobel Peace Prize committee, in announcing that the 1970 prize was going to Dr. Norman Borlaug, developer of the "wonder" wheat, summed up the euphoria by saying that, because of the "green revolution," "we do not any longer have to be pessimistic about the economic future of the developing countries."

How could the world be so misled? One reason was the flourishing public relations work of AID and the foundations. Another reason can be found in a book written in the early 1950s which noted that "when a white-coated scientist, looking up from his microscope, makes a pronouncement for the public, he may not be understood but he is certain to be believed. No one doubts a scientist." The book's title, "Science is a Sacred Cow," is appropriate when one remembers that the "green revolution" was promoted by the scientific branch of the development community.

For instance, Dr. Borlaug said, "You have to be brutally frank with some governments; you have to push them into using (the new technology) . . . it doesn't do any good to get 10 or 15 per cent yield increases, they won't listen to you. You have to throw the long bomb. You have to make a 100 or 200 per cent gain to change their old worn-out practices." Dr. D. S. Athwahi, Associate Director of the foundation-financed International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), where the "miracle" rice was developed, says, "What we are saying is either you apply the new technology or you starve."

I remember well a photograph of President Johnson visiting IRRI, a science showcase in the Far East, and listening spell-bound to the

gesticulating director, Dr. Robert F. Chandler, in front of a large billboard which blazoned the message, "Newly Developed Rice Selections . . . Produce Up To 400% More Rice, Make Rice Growing Profitable."

The American Association for the Advancement of Science advertises one of its publications by saying, "New methods and techniques will make it possible to meet the food needs of the world's rapidly increasing population throughout the 21st Century." It is a preposterous promise, for at current rates the world's population will have grown from today's 3.5 billion to 37 billion by the end of the next century.

BREATH-TAKING HOPE

The truth is that, while the new wheat and rice varieties are excellent high yielders under certain specialized conditions (controlled irrigation, high fertilization), they have done little to overcome the biological limits of the average farm. The hungry nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America are hungry because they have a poor piece of agricultural real estate, and no one should delude them into believing that some sort of technological wizardry can nullify the consequences of too many people on too little arable land.

But if AID officials and their supporters were to admit this to Congress, they would destroy a major argument for more money. For instance, in the 1973 congressional presentation of its program, AID said, "Significant and even exciting technological gains have been made in important food crops. . . . Keeping up the pace of this progress will be a difficult though far from impossible task" (italics mine).

The hope held out to Congress is breath-taking. For example, research on agricultural problems in Latin America, AID says, "has resulted, where the improved management practices have been adopted, in yields of 200 bushels per acre of corn where 80-bushel crops were the usual production. The long time effect of this research should result in yields increases on the nearly 300 million acres of land cultivated in Latin America. . . . research in arid and subhumid lands in Asia has demonstrated that, in India and Pakistan alone, yields on the existing 100 million acres of irrigated land can be more than doubled by the application of modern irrigation practices. . . ."

Where is the congressman who would vote against such a program? And if Congress takes hope, think what visions of sugarplum fairies dance before the eyes of the hungry nations. Why should they not feel that AID's technology will eliminate their problems, or at least materially reduce them?

THE ONLY HOPE

Yet if one looks at some of the characteristics which developing nations hold in common. It is clear the only hope to solve their food problems lies in extreme action of such gargantuan dimensions that they dwarf any help our dollars or technology can offer: 85 per cent of their people depend on agriculture for a living, though 25 per cent of the labor force is either unemployed or underemployed, they grow a narrow range of crops which are excessively susceptible to both pests and market fluctuations; most of their land is broken, mountainous, swampy or desert, with water the most critical factor affecting production. Malnutrition is rampant.

With enough capital some of these problems could be remedied, but this none of the hungry countries have, and few have much credit left. Of the \$59 billion they have borrowed from the industrialized world, \$33 billion falls due in the five-year period 1970-75.

Yet we hear of much progress in these nations, of how the poorest countries in the world (with a per-capita gross national prod-

uct of less than \$300 and containing 67 per cent of the developing nation's population) have been growing economically at nearly 4 per cent a year for 10 years; a rate faster than their population. This sounds fine, but in general it has meant that their rich have gotten richer while their poor have either remained the same or are, indeed, poorer. More people, not fewer, are worse off today than 10 years ago.

"When you rip aside the confusing figures on growth rates," says Pakistan economist Mahbub ul Haq, "you find that for about two-thirds of humanity the increase in per capita income has been less than one dollar a year for the last 20 years."

THE POPULATION CRUNCH

American presidents have told us AID is necessary because "the wealthy nations cannot survive as islands of abundance in a world of hunger, sickness and despair." This is utter nonsense, for we are doing so now, like it or not, and we are going to continue to do so, like it or not.

Every day the gap widens and at an accelerating pace. In 1960 the per capita GNP gap between the rich and poor countries was \$2,000; today it is \$3,000. World Bank President Robert S. McNamara says, "Projected to the end of the century . . . the people of the developed countries will be enjoying per capita incomes, in 1972 prices, of more than \$8,000 a year, while the masses of the poor . . . will on average receive less than \$200 per capita, and some 800 million of these will receive less than \$100. . . ."

While some countries have doubled and tripled the size of their school systems during the past 10 years, each year there are more illiterates. The trouble, of course, is that even before they are started, development efforts are defeated by the steady, uncontrolled growth in population. Development experts once thought the millennium had arrived when India produced a record .95 million tons of food grains in 1967-68. Today, however the experts refer to the projected 1972-73 Indian crop of 100 million tons as a "critically low figure." The reason: This year's crop must feed 70 million more Indians than it did in 1967.

Mexico is often cited as one of the world's best agricultural success stories. It was there that Dr. Borlaug of the Rockefeller Foundation developed his "wonder" wheat. Congressional committees and others have often heard that since the Rockefeller Foundation scientists began working there, Mexico no longer has to import wheat and corn. This supposed self-sufficiency, unfortunately, has been greatly exaggerated. Mexican price supports or cost of production or both have priced corn and wheat out of reach of a large percentage of Mexicans. Malnutrition is a major problem in Mexico—clear evidence that Mexico's agriculture does not produce the food her people need.

Speaking of this, a former U.S. ambassador to Mexico once told me, "We can't convince the Mexican government that a population problem exists; as long as agricultural production is growing as fast as the population, they don't think there is anything to be concerned about."

Since World War II Mexico, like most of the developing world has been able to increase its agricultural production primarily by putting new land into production, not through new technology. But now, like the rest of the hungry world, it is harder and harder to find new land to develop. If its population continues to grow at the present rate, the next 40 years will see Mexico's population mushroom from 50 million to 200 million, a number beyond the capabilities of her limited farm land to feed.

WHAT IS SELF-HELP?

Throughout the history of our aid program, Congress has been told that all the United States wants to do is help those people who will help themselves. Thus President Truman said our aim was to "help the free peoples of the world through their own efforts," and President Johnson said, "The key to victory is self-help." Today's AID administrator, John Hannah, says, "We recognize that the developing countries are responsible for their own development. . . ."

Such statements seem clear when made, but what is "self-help"? The concept offers no guidelines for the expenditure of our aid money because no country intentionally tries self-harm. They are all making an effort to improve their lot. And "self-help" is just as confusing to the recipient nation. A friend in the Dominican Republic once told me that his concept of "self-help" was that of a U.S. supermarket where a developing nation strolls along the AID shelves and helps itself to what it wants: a power plant here, a road there, and next an irrigation canal.

The United States has made a noble effort to help the developing world solve its problems. In doing so, however, we have given a false hope that we really can develop these regions—if the world would only listen to us and Congress would only be more generous with dollars. The resulting confidence has let the hungry nations concentrate on programs often completely unrelated to their basic problem: the population-food crunch.

Virtually every knowledgeable authority agrees that drastic action must be taken if the crunch is not to become catastrophic. "To delay progress toward full self-regulation of population size is to play 'Russian roulette' with the future of man," says a National Academy of Sciences report. Yet nowhere has the necessary extreme action been under taken, nor will it be until the developing world realizes that there is nothing the industrialized nations can do, in the form of foreign aid, about the population problem.

Cruel though the statement might sound, India would be a more viable nation today if in 1965 the United States had not shipped a fifth of its wheat crop to that subcontinent, thereby averting a famine and saving perhaps 30 million or more Indian lives (President Johnson put the figure at 60 million). The catastrophic shock of so many deaths in 1965-66 probably would have shaken India's political structure to the core and slowed down or stopped entirely its nationalist aspirations, such as needless expenditures on flag-carrying airlines and military operations against neighbors. Its agriculture would surely be receiving a greater percentage of the national budget, and we could expect the citizenry to be far more responsive to government efforts to control births (the Indian government might not have to report, as it did this year, that "Thus far, the rate of population growth has shown no declining tendency"). Nor would we have seen India relax into euphoric talk about food self-sufficiency, as it did in 1971 after having a couple of good monsoons—which led to further dallying with its problems.

AID WITHOUT AID

One reason why no drastic action is being taken in the world against the population-food crunch is the false hope that foreign aid provides. So long as there is such a false hope, governments will not initiate the action most needed. The time has come then, for aid without AID.

The hungry nations must be helped by not helping them, by letting them know they must solve their own problems and that the only way they can do this is with their own energies and motivation. Most of the develop-

ing world knows what needs to be done. We must let them do it.

No new scientific gismo needs to be invented to control runaway population growth. Birth control techniques already exist. What does not exist is the motivation to use them. If the leaders of the hungry nations—Mrs. Gandhi, Gen. Suarto, President Marcos and others—could be convinced that so long as present trends continue famine is inevitable, they may well stop following their politically "safe" but dawdling courses. They would have to stop spending so much money on such things as elaborate road systems, military establishments and petrochemical industries that not only produce needed fertilizer but a hundred other less crucial "national" products.

The hungry nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America spend \$26 billion annually on armaments—three times what they receive in official development assistance. If this \$26 billion, or a large part of it, were spent on tube wells, irrigation ditches, fertilizer and agricultural research, it might become possible to head toward a true "green revolution." If, simultaneously, the nations' communications industries focused on teaching the perils of a six-child (and even a three-child) family, and if economic rewards went to those who practiced what the nation preached, a significant birthrate drop might be possible. Then, indeed famine would not be inevitable.

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1973]

INDIA TO IMPORT MORE GRAIN AS HEDGE AGAINST DROUGHT

NEW DELHI, June 2 (Reuters).—India has decided to import more grain to build stocks and to combat severe drought in parts of the country, the Minister of State for Food and Agriculture said yesterday.

The Minister, Annasaheb Shinde, said at a news conference that he could not yet announce how much grain would be imported and that this would depend upon the progress of the Government's plan to build up stocks and on the effect of the monsoon rains, due in Western India in less than two weeks.

Mr. Shinde said that Government efforts to build up stocks were running behind schedule. They had been delayed, he said, because some farmers were holding their grain in the hope that the Government would increase the price. Mr. Shinde said that the Government still intended to nationalize the wholesale rice trade later this year, as it had nationalized wheat on April 1.

U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT

Hunger, mainly resulting from drought, is rising in *Africa, India, China*. As things look now, the coming year could be one of the century's hungriest.

In *India*, as the first touches of monsoon rain reach the hills, drought and famine are threatening at least 80 million people with hunger and starvation before October's harvest. So far, deaths are minimal. But worse is to come.

Bangladesh, miserable after the civil war, has promises of enough grain from U.S. alone to supply 6 million people for a year. More is needed.

Mainland China, with one bad harvest last year, faces another. Drought or floods mean food shortages, hunger, and increasing unrest ahead.

West Africa is struggling through the worst of five to seven years of drought. Six former French colonies are hardest hit—Chad, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Upper Volta, Senegal. Millions of cattle, unknown numbers of people among the 10 million threatened have already died.

U.S., once beset by grain surpluses, now has not only grain-short Russia but much of the world lining up to get what grain the Americans can spare.

EXHIBIT 1

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION

[In millions of dollars]

	Continuing resolution, fiscal year 1974	Committee recommendation, fiscal year 1974	Fulbright substitute
Supporting assistance for South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.	\$ 450.0	376.0	376.0
International organizations.	94.1	120.0	120.0
Indus Basin.	9.0	14.0	14.0
Worldwide development loans.	175.8		\$ 125.0
Worldwide technical assistance grants.	140.8		100.0
Alliance for Progress.	204.1		150.0
Loans.	(134.4)		(100.0)
Grants.	(69.7)		(50.0)
Population.	89.8	(^c)	(^c)
New development assistance categories: ^a			
Food and nutrition.		282.0	
Population planning and health.		141.0	
Education and human resources.		94.0	
Selected development problems.		47.0	
Selected countries and organizations.		28.0	
Miscellaneous categories:			
American schools and hospitals.	9.0	\$ 19.0	19.0
International narcotics control program.		40.0	40.0
Contingency.	22.4	23.5	23.5
Partners of the Alliance.		9.9	9.9
Administrative expenses (AID).	45.9	49.0	49.0
Totals.	1,240.9	1,234.4	1,017.4

¹ The same amounts are recommended for fiscal year 1975 for all programs with the exception of the international narcotics control program for which \$30,500,000 is authorized and American schools and hospitals abroad and assistance to South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos for which funds are authorized only for fiscal year 1974.

² Estimate.

³ In addition, \$251,000,000 in loan reflows will be available for relending.

⁴ \$125,000,000 earmarked out of all categories for population programs.

⁵ Not more than 50 percent of the amounts appropriated for these categories may be used for grants. In addition, \$251,000,000 in repayments on outstanding foreign assistance loans will be available for relending in fiscal year 1974.

⁶ In addition \$6,500,000 in excess foreign currencies are authorized.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times on August 1, 1973, entitled "How Foreign Aid Hurts India," an article entitled "Foreign Aid: Politics of Resentment"; and a table showing the estimated unliquidated obligations by appropriation item for fiscal year 1973.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 1, 1973]

HOW FOREIGN AID HURTS INDIA

To the Editor: In reference to Bernard Weinraub's July 25 news story "India Expresses Desire to Broaden Relations with U.S." I would like to state that better Indo-U.S. relations can only be built on a "zero aid" position.

Foreign aid—that is, government-to-government loans on low interest rates and long maturity periods—neither promotes economic growth nor betters political relations. In fact, it worsens both.

The overwhelming majority of the Indian people (and, I learn, the American people as well) are against foreign aid. At best, only a small fraction of the top bureaucracy in both countries want foreign aid. In India, foreign aid sustains sometimes directly and most often indirectly the high conspicuous

consumption of a small elite, and consequently the investment pattern based on aid availability is distorted to bolster such consumption.

The availability of money and grain on easy terms makes this elite postpone hard decisions, on essential reforms such as economy in government expenditure, land reform and tax restructure. My study shows that, consequently, a dollar of foreign aid instead of supplementing domestic saving actually depresses it by more than a dollar.

What India badly needs is immediate self-reliance—that is, to tailor its import bill to its export earnings. Long-term credit on the international capital market is also permissible because foreign capital obtained this way is disciplined to optimal uses by the market interest rate that the Indian economy would have then to pay. To qualify for such loans, India will have to improve its "crediting," which will create additional pressures at home for serious reforms.

Finally, no one in India feels that foreign aid is motivated in the U.S. or Soviet Union by the "largeness of the heart" or that it entails a sacrifice for the donor country. An index of this feeling is the fact that Mrs. Gandhi ran the 1972 provincial elections on the main, appealing plank of *purna arthik swaraj*, i.e., self-reliance. To deviate from this election promise is good for nobody—Indians or Americans.

SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY.

(NOTE.—The writer is an economist currently teaching at the Harvard University summer school. He is also a member of the Central Working Committee of the Bharatiya Jana Sangh, India's second-largest political party.)

[From the Washington Star-News, July 25, 1973]

FOREIGN AID: THE POLITICS OF RESENTMENT (By Smith Hempstone)

Of all the billions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money which profligate administrations have sown around the world in the past quarter-century, none has reaped such a bitter harvest as the \$10 billion pumped into India since 1950.

It always was naive to suppose that those nations which the United States so generously aided would be grateful for the assistance: Dependency is seldom a happy relationship. And yet in an era in which ironies abound, it is somehow doubly ironic that past American generosity should poison present relations between Washington and New Delhi.

Just the other day, American Ambassador to India Daniel Patrick Moynihan met with Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to announce the termination of the U.S. aid program and to find a way to dispose of a mountain of U.S.-owned rupees worth \$840 million which Washington cannot possibly spend and the existence of which affronts Indian sensibilities. The rupees are a debt incurred by India for the purchase of surplus food in famine years at cut-rate, long-term prices.

Americans rightly find it hard to turn away from people dying of hunger. Yet it is arguable that the provision of food to avert famine did India no favor: It simply made it possible for millions of people the land could not support to survive and procreate children who, in their turn, are doomed to lives of hunger and want.

Indeed, the churlish Indian response to United States assistance calls into question the whole concept of foreign aid. And high time, too.

The great success of the Marshall Plan, under which Europe rose phoenix-like from the ashes of World War II, fostered the simplistic notion that, given enough money, technical assistance and goodwill, poverty could be banished from the earth and the

most backward nations introduced to the glories of industrialism and consumerism.

The point the ideologists missed—or chose to ignore—was that, in the case of Western Europe, we were dealing with nations which had already undergone the historical experience of industrialization. They had the skills, the institutions and the desire to become again what they once had been. The foundations, the preconditions, were there; in Western Europe, the job was one of reconstruction, not construction, and the difference is immense. In the Third World, we were trying to build bricks without straw, and to lay them on sand.

The point is that we know virtually nothing about the determinants of development. Theories abound, but there are no provable absolutes.

If you will look at a map of the world, you will see that, in general, the developed countries lie well north of the Tropic of Cancer (the U.S., Canada, Europe, the Soviet Union and Japan) or south of the Tropic of Capricorn (Chile, Argentina, Brazil, South Africa and Australia). In between these parallels lie the barefoot nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Some theorists postulate that Protestantism and industrialization are linked, that the Moslem-Catholic prohibition against usury made impossible the accumulation of capital necessary for development. Others suggest that there is a linkage between climate and development. Still others are of the opinion that diet is the determining factor, that meat-eaters ultimately prevail over grain-eaters, and grain-eaters over rice-eaters.

There is always the danger of confusing cause with effect, and the probability is that there is no single reason why one nation or group of nations is developed and others are not. Religion, climate, diet, national attitudes and social organization probably all play a role.

The point is that only a people, a nation, can determine what it wants to be. Nobody else can effectively make that determination for it. Many underdeveloped nations want the fruits of industrialization: automobiles, sewing machines, transistor radios, Coca Cola. But, for reasons which we do not fully understand, they are unable or unwilling to create and sustain the preconditions for their own industrialization.

The concern has been more with appearances than with realities. Let a nation attain independence and the first things its rulers want are a steel mill, a national airline and a mammoth sports stadium. Never mind that its real needs are a workable population-control policy, an effective agricultural extension program and a system of simple vocational schools. These are not ego-massaging prestige projects.

And when resources in the form of money and technicians are received from abroad, this obviates the need for their generation at home, to the detriment of local pride, initiative and the development of responsive and responsible institutions.

In short, nobody appreciates something for nothing and it's high time we got out of the foreign aid business, except on a highly selective basis.

Foreign assistance and related programs—estimated unliquidated obligations by appropriation item, fiscal year 1973

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriation title—Title I—Foreign Assistance Activities

Development assistance:	
Development loans	(1,841.3)
Worldwide	885.5
Alliance for Progress	955.8
Development grants	(161.4)
Worldwide	110.1
Alliance for Progress	51.3

Population programs	155.0
International organizations:	
United Nations development program and other programs	
U.N. technical assistance and other programs	
U.N. Environment Fund	
Indus Basin Development Fund, loans	
Indus Basin Development Fund, grants	
Refugee relief assistance (Bangladesh)	167.6
American schools and hospitals abroad	23.6
International narcotics control	12.2
Contingency Fund	30.1
Administrative expenses:	
AID	4.5
State	1.5
Prototype desalting plant	
Subtotal, development assistance	2,397.2
Indochina postwar reconstruction	
Military assistance:	
Military assistance	791.5
Regional naval training	
International military education and training	
Security supporting assistance	469.3
Subtotal military and security supporting assistance	1,260.8
Overseas Private Investment Corporation, reserves	151.1
Inter-American Foundation (limitation on obligations)	3.4
Total, title I Foreign Assistance Act activities	3,776.5
Title II—Foreign military credit sales	747.7
Total title I and title II	4,524.2

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am not clear what the Senator from Arkansas said in regard to the settlement with the Indian Government. Did I understand the Senator to say that if that pattern is followed with all the other nations which owe money to the United States, the cost would be \$20 billion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is applied to the dollar debt; these were to a great extent foreign currency debts accumulated.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. That \$900 million also could be used for neighboring countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Their currency is not convertible. The Indian agreement did not allow that.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am speaking now of the total Indian debt of \$3 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Of the total debt, we will get \$100 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Which means it is being settled at a rate of 3 cents on the dollar. The \$900 million is still in local currency.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Then there is \$2 billion in addition to the \$900 million and the \$100 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are forgiving the \$2 billion. It is like settling a bankruptcy case.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. As a practical matter, we are getting 3 cents on a dollar.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself another 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. The Senate approved on Friday legislation which would require that settlement to be approved by Congress before it may become effective.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right. The Senate enacted it. I do not know when it will be passed, but I approved it. I supported it.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I offered it today on this bill, and it was approved on this bill, because I thought it might not be considered germane on the military procurement bill, but it certainly would be considered germane on this bill, which is the foreign aid bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly. As the Senator knows, I approve of that. I think we ought to approve these settlements. I do not know that we have much alternative—

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. In any case, since it is tax funds, money owned to the taxpayers of the country, the decision should be made, not by the executive branch, but by the legislative branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree. The point is, why do we want to pour additional funds into these areas?

The bill we are now considering was a substitute offered by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Vermont. They wrote it in collaboration with the AID people. The bill I offer as a substitute is in the form of the bill which the administration favored, except for the amount.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. It is a tighter bill and it is of a lesser amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; the administration, subsequent to the action of the committee, said it would support the committee action, because it was in a bigger amount than my bill.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. The Senator's bill offers a lesser amount?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; \$217 million less than the reported bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand it, the proposal would reduce substantially funds for the Alliance for Progress.

As I also understand it, a task force is already at work so as to get up aid to the new government of Chile. As I understand, if any of our aid money goes to Chile, it would come out of Alliance for Progress loans and grants; correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is an article in Newsweek of October 8, 1973, entitled "Slaughter in Santiago." I have seen many reports of organized murder, but this one is about the worst. It is a report by one John Barnes, who tells in detail of these frightful killings of the Chilean people, despite the denial by the Chilean Government that anything of that character is going on.

Inasmuch as I am told the AID people are already planning to now send aid to

October 2, 1973

S 18397

Chile, and inasmuch as we very promptly recognized this takeover by military totalitarians of a duly elected government, regardless of the merits or demerits of said previous administration, this amendment would make it more difficult for us to give aid to this military junta, would it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know. The administration intends to give them aid. They recognized the new government quickly, and I assume they approve of it. The administration continued to give military equipment, but cut off economic aid during the Allende regime. The administration was devoted to supporting the Greek colonels. The Foreign Relations Committee voted to stop aid to the Greek colonels when they were alleged to be mistreating people, but the administration overrode the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In this article, John Barnes writes after being told eight people were the total killed:

Last week I slipped through a side door into the Santiago city morgue, flashing my junta press pass with all the impatient authority of a high official. One hundred and fifty dead bodies were laid out on the ground floor . . .

I ask unanimous consent that at the end of this colloquy the article in question, "Slaughterhouse in Santiago," be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It would seem we are having enough problems with our economy at home without taking the money of our taxpayers to support governments that operate on any such basis.

EXHIBIT 1

SLAUGHTERHOUSE IN SANTIAGO

Pablo Neruda, Chile's Noble Prize-winning poet, was dead of cancer, and even as his body was lowered into its grave, his countrymen set about trying to murder his words. Books of all kinds, not only Neruda's but those by Mao and Marx and Marcuse, were seized by the tens of thousands from homes, bookstores and libraries and then fed to bonfires in the streets of Santiago. And the military junta that has ruled Chile for three weeks didn't stop there. Chilean universities, once proud bastions of independence, were purged of suspected leftists, and ordinary people learned to dread the midnight knock on the door. All that was bad enough, but Newsweek correspondent John Barnes discovered last week that the reign of terror has already gone much further than most people thought. Below, Barnes's report:

The military junta will not admit that there have been mass executions since the overthrow of Salvador Allende's Marxist government. "We have executed perhaps eight people since then for shooting at troops," Col. Pedro Ewing told newsmen. But that simply is not true. Last week, I slipped through a side door into the Santiago city morgue, flashing my junta press pass with all the impatient authority of a high official. One hundred and fifty dead bodies were laid out on the ground floor, awaiting identification by family members. Upstairs, I passed through a swing door and there in a dimly lit corridor lay at least 50 more bodies, squeezed one against another,

their heads propped up against the wall. They were all naked.

Most had been shot at close range under the chin. Some had been machine-gunned in the body. Their chests had been slit open and sewn together grotesquely in what presumably had been a pro forma autopsy. They were all young and, judging from the roughness of their hands, all from the working class. A couple of them were girls, distinguishable among the massed bodies only by the curves of their breasts. Most of their heads had been crushed. I remained for perhaps two minutes at most, then left the building.

The next day I returned to the morgue with a Chilean friend so that I would have a witness. I also took along a camera. As I walked through the swing doors of the corridor the sickly sweet smell of the decomposing bodies almost knocked me back. There were more bodies, perhaps 70, and they were different from the day before. Just as I was pulling the camera from my jacket, a man in a white coat walked through the doors at the other end of the corridor. "What do you want?" he asked. "I'm looking for the bathroom," I said. "Come with me," he said. As I followed him, I took a sharp right and ran out of the building. He shouted after me but did not try to follow. I did not have the courage to try again. Later, in my hotel room, my friend burst into tears. "These were my countrymen," he cried. "My God, what has happened to us?"

BODIES

Workers at the morgue have been warned that they will be court-martialed and shot if they reveal what is going on there. But I was able to obtain an official morgue body-count from the daughter of a member of its staff: by the fourteenth day following the coup, she said, the morgue had received and processed 2,796 corpses.

No one knows how many have been disposed of elsewhere; a gravedigger told me of reports that helicopters have been gathering bodies at the emergency first-aid center in central Santiago, then carrying them out to sea to be dumped. One priest informed me that on the Saturday after the coup he had managed to get into the City's Technical University, which had been the scene of heavy fighting, on the pretext of blessing the dead. He told me he saw 200 bodies, all piled together. Tales like that abound in Santiago, and though information is almost nonexistent for the rest of Chile, the presumption is that the executions have followed a similar pattern in other cities. But the morgue count alone sets the regime's kill rate at an appalling 200 Chileans a day—just for the capital.

With hardly an exception, the victims come from the *poblaciones*—the slums that encircle Santiago and house half the city's 4 million inhabitants. During the three turbulent years of Salvador Allende's administration, the poor of the *poblaciones* never wavered in their support of his government, for the fact was that the *rotos* (broken-down ones, as they are contemptuously called by the more affluent) had never had it so good. Despite the soaring inflation, they earned enough money to buy undreamed-of luxuries like new clothes, radios, television sets, refrigerators. Community food-distribution centers in the *poblaciones* were always well stocked, while the shelves of stores elsewhere remained barren. Presumably, the junta believes that since the *poblaciones* provided the former government's main support, they must be terrorized into accepting the fact of its demise. So the local leaders are now paying with their lives for their love of Allende. Not one *poblacion* has escaped the terror.

ROUNDUP

I spoke with three women from the Pincoya *poblacion*. One of them, a mother of

two, had just found out that she was a widow. She told me this tearful story: "Soldiers raided our *poblacion* last Saturday at 8 in the morning. In the section where we live, they rounded up about 50 men and held them until a police lieutenant came to take his pick. When the lieutenant saw my husband, he made him step forward and told him: 'Now you will pay for all you people have done.' The *carabineros* took him and a few others to the police station, and the rest were arrested by soldiers." For three days, she and the other women of Pincoya searched for their men in police stations and the two soccer stadiums where thousands are incarcerated. It was only after they heard that a 17-year-old boy from their block had been found at the morgue—shot in the head and chest—that they made the journey to see the lists of the dead. There they found her husband, Gabriel, as well as every adult male from one block of their *poblacion*.

I joined a funeral procession of weeping families following three coffins to burial. *Carabineros*, I was told, had raided a home in the Parque Santa Maria *poblacion* and had picked up three petty thieves aged 18, 19 and 20. A sergeant told them they would be released if they paid 7,000 escudos—only \$5, but a lot of money to the *poblacion* poor. Their *barrio* raised the money and the youths returned home. But two hours later, a *carabinero* patrol came back to get them. That was the last their families heard, until they found their names on the morgue list. One of the boys was so riddled with bullets that they could hardly dress him for burial. But the fate of the other two was worse. Coffins in Chile have small window doors over the face of the dead, and the women opened them for me. There were no heads inside.

Orlando Contreras, who lives with his wife and seven children in the José María Caro *poblacion*, is in daily dread of an official knock at his door. He is a laborer who worked in Santiago's office of social development, a particular target of the new regime. And he is well aware of the danger he faces, should the soldiers come after him. On the day the coup took place, he told me, he and one of his sons saw ten high-school students marched from their school, their hands over their heads, after a brief skirmish with *carabineros*. They were forced to lie face down on the ground, and then a policeman walked the line of prone youngsters, spraying them with machinegun fire.

The stories of atrocities are endless, and by now, inhabitants of the *poblaciones* are utterly terrified. "I am too afraid to look for him," says a woman from the Ultima Hora *poblacion*, whose husband was last seen covered with blood being hauled away in a police truck. "I am afraid that they will take me, too, and what would happen then to my four children?" Many are now afraid even to associate with families that had any connection with Allende's regime—whether as party members, union leaders or employees in the food-distribution centers. "They can kill whomever they want to kill," says Contreras bitterly. "There is nothing, absolutely nothing, that we can do about it."

Because of the total censorship of domestic reporting, most middle- and upper-class Chileans have no idea what is happening. They hear rumors, but their hatred for Allende compounded by their historic contempt for the *rotos* leaves them little desire to verify them. Many do not believe the stories about slaughter in the *poblaciones*; many simply don't much care. "Why should we?" a Chilean lawyer asked me over an expensive lunch in a wealthy section of Santiago. "I don't believe the stories you tell me, but after the things the supporters of Salvador Allende have done to Chile, they deserve whatever happens to them."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

October 2, 1973

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in order to put things in their proper perspective, I would like to state that the amendment offered by the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), is the proposal which Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman approved when they were top officials in the White House. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota and myself is the proposal Dr. John Hanna, who was Director of AID in those days, submitted to the White House, and he did not get to first base with it.

However, Dr. Hanna knew what he was doing. His bill was a good one. And after the "high commissioners," as you might call them, had left the White House, those who came in and replaced them supported his bill, approved it, and the Senator from Minnesota and I have offered it.

The adoption of the amendment offered by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would undoubtedly mean the death of foreign aid. It means that, if it is approved, the task of getting a bill out of conference will be much tougher, and undoubtedly impossible.

The Senate and House have already passed separate versions of military aid legislation. That will make our task in conference complicated enough. If we now add to it separate and distinct economic aid measures, the differences in conference will be so great that the most likely outcome will be no foreign assistance legislation at all.

There may be some who wish such an outcome. There may be those who say that we should give up all foreign aid completely and should forget these countries which we have helped for the last 20 years. Indeed, this is a legitimate and valid goal if that is the way they feel. However, if the Senate wants to end the foreign assistance program, then it should legislate an end to it. It should not fall into the trap of using the procedures of Congress as a means of accomplishing indirectly what cannot be accomplished directly.

I fear that the pending measure leads us to the brink of that trap, and if it is approved today, it may well leave the entire economic aid program in a dire condition.

We cannot afford to sever our humanitarian connections with the rest of the world in this manner.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this would replace essentially what the Church amendment would have done, an amendment that the Senate defeated narrowly. At a time like this when we scrutinize so carefully every particular expenditure, I think the fact that 47 Members of the Senate felt in conscience that they ought to vote "no" is an excellent endorsement of what the committee did.

Second, and in addition to a steeper cut than the Senate rejected when it rejected a cut of \$134 million already, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT)

proposes that we make a cut of \$217 million.

The Fulbright amendment rejects any hope of any new concept in this field. I can only conclude, because in essence that is what the Senator says in his minority report which is before the Senate, that it means really a rejection of the whole thing.

On page 66, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) in his minority views, says:

Rejection of this bill would be a step in the right direction. A major portion of this bill is but a camouflage job to give a new lease on life to a discredited program.

In my judgment, this kind of cut, steep as it is, means in essence rejection. We simply cannot move in respect of any kind of an appreciable program which is respectable enough for our country with respect to the rest of the world if we make this kind of steep cut.

Let us remember that the Senate has already decided in the second Church amendment to allocate cuts. Without any question, the recycling of funds for all practical purposes puts another \$250 million in the bill into the straight authorization and reappropriation route rather than stamping it as a circulated fund out of which foreign aid may be forthcoming.

Mr. President, I think that perhaps the most damaging part of the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas offers to the Senate is the fact that it eliminates in one pen stroke any effort to bring the foreign aid program into areas where it must go after a maturation of such a long period of years. It eliminates the opportunity for us to reach what we now consider to be its best constituent population—namely, the very poor and the very poor nations through a sectoral funding approach which has been included in the bill through the gifted intervention of Dr. Hannah as carried through by the Senators.

Mr. President, I feel that it would be a great mistake on our part to turn back the clock at this time. The real issue is between whether we want any program or whether we want one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I made my position clear. I have stated for the last 5 years that I support a full-fledged multinational foreign aid program. I have never voted against any appropriations for any international organizations.

The trouble is that they are moving on both fronts: bilateral and multilateral. I cannot support both. This program engages us in the internal affairs of other countries.

I think that it is time to end bilateral assistance except for very small technical assistance programs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard the Senator with great respect, as I always do. However, today the "they" is very important to identify in his statement. And the "they" is the very body which the Senator appeals to, in my judgment, to dismantle the bilateral aid program.

The fact is that the Congress has not appropriated the necessary resources for these international agencies. We are a year behind in respect to the World Bank, although our percentage has been materially reduced. It has been reduced from 40 percent to one-third.

We have already appropriated half of what we said we would do as far as the International Bank is concerned. We have appropriated nothing for the Asian Bank, although the Japanese have put up the money. And we have appropriated nothing for the African Bank. That does not put any money in any bill or provide any services or anything else.

I feel about this as I argued with respect to the Church amendment, that it becomes shameful at this point that our Nation, with relatively great resources should act in this manner. Although surely we have many poor citizens, and life is a matter of degree, the fact is that we cannot satisfy every need around the world. That does not mean that we should not look after on a philanthropic and a humanitarian basis, other people. I always do, and so does everyone else.

There is no reason why we should practice a different kind of morality internationally than we do personally and nationally.

Two-thirds of the world is abjectly miserable compared to us. How can we, 200 million Americans, who live in a state that is unparalleled in mankind, avert our eyes and say that \$1 billion will corrupt the \$250 million budget.

I deeply believe that, and I deeply believe that the American people would feel that we would have to give foreign aid to other peoples of the world.

We rehabilitated Europe when it had problems. And we have rehabilitated other countries. We give our poor less, perhaps, than we should. Life is like that. We cannot exactly apportion things with a scalpel and say that this is what it should be.

We are now away under the margin, and that is indicated by the fact that other countries are doing a great deal more than we. And they are no angels. They are just as selfish and have as many problems as we have. This goes for countries in the world that have half and one-third the income that our country has.

I think that the common decency which the American people have always shown dictates that this program cannot be cut any further, although by a narrow margin that is what my colleagues decided on the Church amendment. The Senate should decide against the Fulbright amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time remains to the opponents of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, first I want to express my thanks to the Senator from Vermont, the distinguished dean of the Senate, and to the Senator from New York, one of the most active, able, and dedicated Members of this body in the field of

foreign relations, for their penetrating arguments in opposition to this amendment. The argument has been made again and again, in and out of committee and here again today.

I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. President, I never thought I would see the day when the chairman would rise in this body to support the same old foreign aid. Indeed, his posture is doubly anomalous in the light of his new assistance package, S. 2059, which is pending in committee. I suppose that he sees the old foreign aid concept as more vulnerable to our existing criticism and, finally, to the substitution of his new concept.

Let us not be confused by this maneuver. As I stated in my opening remarks, our committee has been after the executive branch to change its directions in foreign aid for quite a few years. We have expressed our concern with the failure of our aid program to reach the poor people of lesser developed countries and with its failure to address those people's human problems, such as malnutrition, overpopulation, and illiteracy. We did that as early as 4 years ago, when we were scarcely noticed, and we voiced our concerns again 2 years ago.

Well, we generated some talk but not much action. Dr. John Hannah, whom I have known for many years and whom I consider to be an extremely able AID Administrator, heard our concerns and started trying to change the AID program to meet our concerns. But Dr. Hannah could not get the rest of the administration to propose new legislation along these lines.

Therefore, a bipartisan group of Senators and Members of the other body introduced a bill to execute our ideas. Thirteen Senators, six from the majority party and seven from the minority, cosponsored the original legislation. Twenty-six Representatives—17 Democrats and 9 Republicans—sponsored the House version of our bill. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported it by a 12 to 3 vote. Why? Because it is not the same old foreign aid.

The committee bill, not the chairman's substitute, meets Congress' concerns with the foreign aid program and restructures it to assure that these concerns are adhered to. The committee bill embodies our general policy in seven specific expressions and guarantees the execution of that policy by authorizing foreign aid by impact sector rather than by method of delivery.

Let us get specific. We would authorize \$282 million for agriculture, rural development and nutrition to alleviate starvation, hunger, and malnutrition and to provide basic services to poor people. We would authorize \$141 million for population planning and health to increase the opportunities and motivation for family planning, to reduce the rate of population growth, to prevent and combat disease, and to help provide health services for the majority of poor people. We would authorize \$94 million for education, public administration, and human resource development to reduce illiteracy, to extend basic education and to increase basic skills.

Recognizing the need for, but the narrower impact of, big project assistance, we would cut authorization in this field to \$47 million, to help solve economic and social problems in fields such as transportation, power, industry, urban development, and export development. We would also cut the authorization for general economic support programs, in this instance, to \$28 million, again recognizing that the impact of such programs is not as directly related to the poor people as we would like it to be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; I yield myself 1 minute.

Is there any project that the Senator can think of that could not be financed under our substitute, that is authorized under the Senate bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think that is the issue, as the Senator will find out as I go into it. The point is that Congress is saying how we should spend this money. The Senator, believe it or not, is saying we are just going to leave it up to the administration. What we are doing is saying there are certain sectors where this money will be expended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator says, under his bill, 50 percent of it can be given away, exactly the same way I would give it under my bill. There is no difference whatever in the type of activity that can be financed under either bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say the Senator's language speaks for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 1 minute has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It says what can be done, while the Senate bill that we have before us tells what will be done. It points the direction; it is a map clearly outlining it.

What the Senator from Arkansas says is, "Here is the whole blank check; make the choice of the way you want to go." We are saying we have gone up that wandering trail in the past, and we want to have these funds dedicated to certain areas of conduct and activity.

Both the committee bill and the chairman's substitute authorize the use of loan repayments for future foreign aid loans.

It is interesting to me that the chairman of the committee voted for the Church amendment, which would compel the loan repayment program to go to the Appropriations Committee, even though his own substitute ignores that very vote here today in the Senate. Our bill, however, limits the use of these repayments to a maximum of one-third for any of the five impact sectors. The chairman's bill does not limit it at all. Thus, we are sure that these repayments will be directed into future loans with direct impact on poor people. Under the chairman's substitute, we have no such assurance of the direction of future loans to be made from repaid foreign aid loans.

The chairman's substitute is even more deficient in its basic approach to foreign

aid. It continues to leave the executive branch with complete flexibility in programming loans and grants, regardless of the impact of those loans and grants. Under the chairman's substitute, "the old foreign aid concept," the executive branch could put the entire foreign aid program into general budget support for a select number of countries which it happens to favor at any given time, regardless of the impact on malnutrition, overpopulation or illiteracy. Our bill, on the other hand, guarantees at least \$282 million to help undernourished people, \$141 million to help combat overpopulation and \$94 million to educate and train the less fortunate. We care, and we want the impact of our cares guaranteed by legislation. The new foreign aid, the committee bill assures that impact.

The chairman talks of cosmetics, and argues that our bill is merely painting up the old girl and waltzing her out again. Well, I cannot buy that argument. When we put title X in the Foreign Assistance Act to assure an impact on population programs, we were not engaged in cosmetics. The Congress wanted to make a dent on worldwide overpopulation and we set aside \$125 million each year for that purpose. That money cannot be used for general budget support, for cement plants, for power stations or even for agricultural development or education. It is population money, and the GAO will assure that we get our dollar's worth in this area.

What we did in the area of population a few years ago, we are doing with almost all of foreign aid this year. We are going to get an impact in beating malnutrition to the tune of \$282 million in population and health to the tune of \$141 million and in education and human development to the tune of \$94 million. We are not going to rely on the good will of the executive branch to get that impact; we are going to write it into law. The chairman would let us continue to rely on the executive branch.

The chairman's substitute and his new bill are all caught up in methods of assistance rather than the result. Like the chairman, I think AID has made mistakes in the past—it has put too much money in governmental budget support and showcase projects. Unlike the chairman, I do not think the AID establishment is all wrong—I think its direction has been. With Dr. Hannah, we turned that agency around and now we are going to guarantee that it does not revert to its old practices. We are going to write our impact provisions into law, just as we did with population in title X.

If you vote for the chairman's substitute, you cannot be sure of what impact you will get for your foreign aid dollar. His substitute provides a cut of \$167 million but returns no congressional control on what his bill would authorize.

I wish other Senators were here. We have been talking about wanting Congress to have more control. The substitute by the distinguished chairman gives Congress no control. Our bill does. We are responding to what has been the concerns expressed in this body.

We have worked too hard on redirect-

ing the foreign aid program to turn it over to two new men, Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Parker, without a clear statement of what we want—and what we are going to get—with our aid dollar. I think it is unwise.

Even if, after we have hearings on the chairman's new packaging bill, we decide to come back to the Senate with a bill to create a new agency, we want to be sure, in the meantime, that the present Agency gets the foreign aid dollar where we, the Congress, wants it to go. This is not putting makeup on the same old girl—it is washing her face and getting her in a completely different line of work.

I think that should be taken note of. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to oppose the amendment offered by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

His amendment would continue the present unsatisfactory status quo in the economic aid program and reduce the amounts to be authorized by the bill by nearly 20 percent. After years of growing dissatisfaction with the foreign aid program, I hope that the Senate is not going to reject this congressional initiative to change the existing policy. Contrary to the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas, this bill does initiate a new policy for our bilateral economic aid program. And this new policy originated in Congress, not the executive branch. It is one which Congress persuaded the executive branch to accept; not the other way around, as the Senator implies.

This bill starts from the proposition that the poorest majority must share in the work of building a nation and must share more equitably in the fruits of development at the outset—not at some future date after growth targets have been met. It insures that the benefits of the foreign aid program actually reach the people. By specifying the fields of endeavor which most directly benefit the poorest majority and committing money to each of those sectors, this bill channels our aid to the people. Each field is responsive to a deeply rooted human problem that permeates the societies of the low-income countries. The three fields of major emphasis are first, food, nutrition, and rural development, second, population planning and health, and third, education and human resource development. This new approach will enable the little guy to be reached more directly. It represents a major change in direction from the way the foreign aid program has been carried out in the past.

This bill also recognizes that America's responsibilities with respect to the developing countries reach far beyond our aid programs. U.S. policies on trade, investment, science policy, oceans, debt relief, and other subjects may affect very profoundly the destinies of the poor countries. Yet, until now, these policies are made without coordination—without systematically informing ourselves of how they will affect our interests in development. This bill institutionalizes a coordinating procedure that would insure that the development factor was always considered. In order to do this, the bill sets up a Development Coor-

inating Committee and makes as its Chairman the head of AID. This procedure will, for the first time, provide a means for considering in one place all of the ramifications of U.S. policies on the developing countries.

The Senator from Arkansas has alleged that this bill weakens congressional control over the foreign aid program. It does just the opposite. Under the existing system Congress votes large lump sums labeled simply "developmental loans" and "technical assistance" which the executive branch can distribute as it sees fit. Under the new approach in S. 2335, Congress specifies very precisely how it wants the foreign aid money it approves to be used—so much for each of five different categories. And projects must be justified to Congress for those categories.

This bill is not a cosmetics job. This bill will insure that our taxpayers' money, that is spent for foreign aid, actually gets down to the people. It turns away from the trickle-down theory that general economic development will automatically help the masses. This bill changes all that. It sets up a new system and new criteria which will channel our foreign aid into projects and programs that touch the daily lives of the poor in the poorest countries.

Now, let us talk about the amounts involved here. The Senator from Arkansas would cut the authorizations in this bill by \$217 million. I want the Senate to know that the amounts in this bill are the lowest recommended for these activities since the foreign aid program began. The committee already cut the administration's request by \$276,000,000. And this bill is \$377,000,000 below the comparable total in the House bill.

Certainly foreign aid should not be continued on a "business as usual" basis in view of our grave fiscal and economic problems. The committee has acted in a responsible way to see that foreign aid bears its fair share of the belt-tightening needed to get the Federal budget in line and our priorities in proper order. This is a tight bill. There is no fat in it.

Mr. President, in summary, I urge the Senate to oppose the amendment. It would continue the present unsatisfactory status quo I am amazed that the Senator would even offer it.

May I say, on behalf of the administration, that once we came up with this concept we have here, we had the support of the President, we had the support of the State Department and we had the support of the AID agency. But we wrote the bill. It was started in the House of Representatives. It was joined over here in the Senate. We had a meeting with Dr. Hanna, and he himself went to the Secretary of State and to the President and got support for our efforts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to state that Dr. Hanna did not get the support of the White House until there had been a change in the high ranking personnel there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from

Vermont is absolutely right. Let me tell you, Mr. President, that the amendment we have here as a substitute is known as the Haldeman-Ehrlichman proposal [Laughter.] That is what it is. We got rid of them. I think, with Dr. Kissinger and with Mr. Parker coming in, that if we lay down these guidelines we will have better foreign aid. I do not say it will be all we want it to be, but I have heard about foreign aid being a failure. Well, we have not abolished poverty in the United States, but I am not about ready to abolish the aid programs we have now for the American people. We have not abolished discrimination in the United States, and we have passed law after law, but I am not about ready to give up on the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator through?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I am just relaxing. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, while the Senator relaxes a moment, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would only comment that the news that Haldeman and Ehrlichman worked on this bill is news to me. I never before heard any time in any of the hearings that they had interested themselves in this foreign aid bill. That is something that is a new line of activity, so far as I know.

Mr. President, the Senator says he is dressing up an old girl. This is an old girl, and I am glad she is trying to reform. But my experience has been that when we try to reform an old girl the reformation does not last beyond the weekend. [Laughter.]

There is nothing new about this. What we are concerned about is the effectiveness of the expenditure of the money that we put out in these many fields.

The Senator from New York made an impassioned argument that what is involved here is just human decency, implying that this is a charitable undertaking.

Actually, on that basis, I suppose it could be justified if we felt like being charitable to that extent. But I say that, even after we have tried the program of aid for so long, the only success that can be cited, of any consequence, is Western Europe under the Marshall Plan. And that was not comparable in any respect whatever to the undeveloped countries where they are trying now to remake a society. Bilateral aid has been almost a complete failure in practically all of these places.

There are a few little showcases where we have spent billions and billions of dollars, but I do not believe it is possible for us to contemplate doing that, in a comparable fashion, all over the world.

I have said before, and I say again with regard to what the Senator from

New York said, that I have supported and voted for the appropriations for the multinational organizations in this field, such as the World Bank, IDA, IFC, the Inter-American Bank, and the Asian Bank. I would support the multilateral institutions because they are the only way that avoids our becoming involved in the internal affairs of these various countries, which we are doing now. If Congress and the Senate continues bilateral aid, then I will have to withdraw my further support, or additional support, of the multinational programs, because I do not believe we are justified in doing both.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely want to say that for the 23 years that I have been in the Senate, I have always supported foreign aid. I daresay, with the exception of the bill the last time, when it was more or less a matter of parliamentary maneuvering on the floor, many of us voted against it as a remonstrance against it, and then the vote was changed. But I have become weary over the years. I believe in the argument of dignity and humanitarianism. Naturally, the American heart has always been a big heart. No matter where in the world, we have always shared our largesse. We have helped the poor; we have helped people in cases of tragedy. But things are beginning to happen in our own society that give us pause in this day and age.

Just the other day, while coming back to Washington from my State by plane, on September 24, I read in the newspaper an article captioned "Old, Decaying Room Fills Widow's Day." This is out of Miami. This is what the article says:

The room is old and decaying and filled with her memories, and from the window Flora Scheurman sometimes sees other old people pawing through garbage cans for scraps of food.

Mind you, this is in America.

This woman of 79 says:

I'm in this room six years now. It's up to \$85 now. I'm worried that it might go up to \$100, and I don't know what I'll do then. How can I pay that out of \$147 a month?

Then she goes on to say:

I don't know what I'd do if I didn't get it. It makes your heart bleed to open the window and see some of those old people eating out of garbage cans, looking for a scrap of bread.

The article concludes:

Mrs. Scheurman said she sometimes wonders why the government spends millions of dollars on foreign aid and politics while the old people who supported it are allowed to live in poverty.

Just the other day, we had the proposal with respect to the increment under social security. It was the Senator's amendment, and I was happy to cosponsor it. The President of the United States said we cannot pay it before July 1, 1974, because that would be inflationary. Here we are with a bill involving more than a billion dollars to feed the hungry throughout the world—a great thing, a noble thing. But when are we going to

begin to take care of our own? How does one stand on this floor to enforce that case and emphasize the fact that charity begins at home? We learned that at our mother's knee. We are not doing it for our elderly in this country. We are not doing it for our underprivileged in this country.

Every year—year in and year out—this Foreign Aid bill comes up here. I congratulate the committee for cutting it by 26 percent. It should be cut even more, until we begin to provide for our own.

Every day I receive letters from the elderly: "I'm looking for a little place to live, and I cannot find one." And this administration has cut out the building for the elderly. People write to me and say, "I cannot live on my social security."

Just the other day, I was visited in my office and I was told that if an elderly couple not on relief want food stamps, they have to go to the relief office, and they will not go because they are too proud. Talk about dignity—we have dignity in the American soul, but it is being neglected.

So I say that unless this bill is cut a little further, I am inclined to vote against it. I hope it is cut a little beyond the 26 percent, because I want to see our elderly in America provided for. I am sick and tired of hearing that every time we give 10 cents on social security, we are talking about inflation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the entire article to which I referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OLD, DECAYING ROOM FILLS WIDOWS DAY

(By Eric Sharp)

MIAMI.—The room is old and decaying and filled with her memories, and from the window Flora Scheurman sometimes sees other old people pawing through garbage cans for scraps of food.

"I'm in this room six years now," says Mrs. Scheurman, 79. "It's up to \$85 right now. I'm worried that it might go up to \$100, and I don't know what I'll do then. How can I pay that out of \$147 a month?"

Mrs. Scheurman lives on about \$4.70 a day provided by two welfare checks. She suffers more financial hardships than thousands of the retirees in the Miami area—and is better off than thousands more.

Until the federal government funded a hot meal program recently, it cost her more than \$2 for her one meal a day. Now, she gets a hot meal at midday for 50 cents, but there are many who don't.

"Before the new program started, I used to run out of money at the end of every month," she said. "Sometimes, I had a can of soup or something to tide me over a few days. Other times I did without."

"I don't know what I'd do if I didn't get it. It makes your heart bleed to open the window and see some of these old people eating out of garbage cans, looking for a scrap of bread."

The plight of the elderly poor in Miami received national publicity recently when police and storekeepers said retirees hit by inflation were shoplifting everything from vitamins to meat.

Max Friedson, 75, head of the Congress of Senior Citizens, said some 250,000 retirees live around this city of 1.2 million, and he estimates 70 per cent need some kind of welfare assistance.

"People come down here on a fixed income for the golden years" he said. "Then infla-

tion eats their income up. Then one of them gets sick and dies after medical expenses eat up their savings.

"Then the survivor can't afford to keep up the little house or apartment they bought and end up living in poverty."

To Friedson, children who send parents to live out their years in the sunshine often do them a disservice.

"These old people are proud, and they don't want to be a burden on their families. A lot of times it isn't until the autopsy that the family learns Mamma starved to death," he said.

Mrs. Scheurman's room is in the old Miller Hotel. Its salad days long past, the Miller and many small hotels like it house thousands of old people in a neighborhood shared with small shops, most of them run by immigrant Cubans.

She was born in Nashville, Tenn., and worked as a practical nurse for many years until illness forced her to stop. She has been in the Miami area since her husband died in 1937.

Her room has a single bed, a dresser, a couple of small tables, two lamps and a fan, all supplied by the hotel. She said the only things she owns are her few clothes, a small television and radio, two pictures, a clock, some books and vases of artificial flowers.

Mrs. Scheurman said she last bought a new dress seven years ago, and her wardrobe was augmented two years ago when a relative gave her nine unwanted dresses.

"The owners of this hotel are very nice. They help the old people as much as they can, and they have a man on duty all night in case you need help," she said.

Mrs. Scheurman's main fear is illness. In the past seven years, she has been hospitalized several times for various illnesses.

"The last time, I had a bleeding ulcer. I passed out over the fan there. I don't know how long I lay there, but I managed to crawl to the phone and the desk clerk called some friends," she said.

For many of the elderly, most of whom live alone, life ends on an apartment floor because they are unable to crawl for help.

Mrs. Scheurman said she can't afford bus fare to visit parks and stores, so tedium is part and parcel of her life.

"I get up about 7 each morning and have a cup of Sanka and some Tang. Then I go down to the church for lunch. I usually get home about 1 p.m. and watch my soap opera. Then I sit for the rest of the day. I can't read much any more because everything runs together after a few lines," she said.

Mrs. Scheurman said she sometimes wonders why the government spends millions of dollars on foreign aid and politics while the old people who supported it are allowed to live in poverty.

"But I'm not unhappy, and I'm not afraid to die," she said. "I sometimes wonder, 'Why can't I go.' But wanting to die is a sin and I ask God to forgive me."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Rhode Island in his sense of compassion. I think my record in this body indicates that—publicly and privately.

It is not a question of either/or. The question before this body is whether or not we just want to forget the rest of the world and pay a price, as we paid once before. We are not throwing this money away. If one wants to look at it in economic terms, it comes back to the United States—more than 80 percent of it. It

October 2, 1973

creates jobs; it creates investments; it creates income.

However, more significantly, since it has been said that charity begins at home, I remind Senators that, in a sense, we are our brother's keeper, to. We are not trying to throw away American dollars. This is the smallest amount of assistance, for the wealthiest Nation in the world, in the history of this country.

Yet, the Senate will appropriate billions of dollars for wasteful material. We will appropriate billions of dollars for weapons that will never be used, planes that will never fly, and ships that will never float.

We are talking about trying to help people feed themselves. We are going to give them food because we cannot afford to let people starve. The American people will not take that.

We are putting \$282 million in this bill to try to help people produce their own food. We are putting in this bill \$125 million to help control population explosion. I think this is a wise investment.

I appreciate the concern of Senators about what happens at home. But I think the biggest mistake in foreign aid has been revealed by the testimony here today. In Korea and Taiwan it worked because they were given enough and it has come back.

I was originally a pharmacist by profession. If you have an infection, do not take 20,000 units of penicillin. It would be better to get yourself some Smith Brothers cough drops, spearmint chewing gum, or licorice. When you have an infection, you get a big enough dose to do the job. We have an infection of poverty, and we have one at home.

The biggest problem with many of our antipoverty programs is that they are penny-pinchers. We do not take a week's time to put \$20 billion on the line for defense, for weaponry about which we have no knowledge as to whether it will work. We take the word of the admirals; we take the word of the committee. We are told that we have to stick with the committee because the committee knows what it is doing. The overwhelming majority of this committee voted for the bill before the Senate, and the substitute has been rejected by the chairman, himself, and he offers it as a substitute today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 64, as follows:

Abourezk
Allen
Bible
Brock
Burdick
Byrd,
Harry F., Jr.
Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Church
Cranston

Alken
Baker
Bartlett
Beall
Bellmon
Bennett
Bentsen
Biden
Brooke
Buckley
Case
Chiles
Clark
Cook
Cotton
Curtis
Dole
Domenici
Dominick
Eastland
Fannin
Pong

[No. 452 Leg.]

YIAS—31

Eagleton
Ervin
Fulbright
Gravel
Hansen
Hartle
Haskill
Hatch
Helms
Hollings
Huddleston

NAYS—64

Goldwater
Griffin
Gurney
Hart
Hathaway
Hruska
Hughes
Humphrey
Inoué
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Kennedy
Long
Magrison
Matthias
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Mondale
Muskie
Neftci

Mansfield
McClellan
McClure
Montoya
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott,
William L.
Symington

Nunn
Packwood
Percy
Ribicoff
Roth
Saxbe
Schweiker
Scott, Hugh
Sparkman
Stafford
Stevens
Stevenson
Taft
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tunney
Welcker
Williams
Young

NOT VOTING—5

Bayh
Metcalfe

Moss
Pearson
Stennis

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment (No. 567) was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1016) to provide a more democratic and effective method for the distribution of funds appropriated by the Congress to pay certain judgments of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 620. An act to establish within the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9205. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to peanuts; and

H.R. 9257. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the rates of employee deductions, agency contributions, and deposits for civil service retirement purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 620. An act to establish within the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9205. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to peanuts. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 9257. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to the rates of employee deductions, agency contributions, and deposits for civil service retirement purposes. Referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENTRY OF SOVIET JEWS INTO AUSTRIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if recent news reports from Austria are accurate, it would seem that international negotiations have been moved from the diplomat's briefcase to the muzzle of the terrorist's gun. The diplomats are designated by their governments. The terrorists designate themselves—if they are successful, they are hailed by those whose cause they support; if unsuccessful, they are disowned.

Two issues emerge. One is whether terrorism—even minor league terrorism of the caliber of the recent incident in Austria—will become the arena for international persuasion and negotiation and dictate policies to governments. As the New York Times pointed out this morning—

Success in terrorism inevitably breeds more desire for more success by the same devices, as governments and travelers around the world have learned.

The other issue is the continuation by Austria of its open-door policy of the past 3 years under which it has permitted transit and has temporarily harbored refugees from the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. Some 100,000 Soviet Jews now breathe the air of freedom in Israel and the West as a result of this policy.

I am especially troubled by allegations in press reports that the decision to terminate the availability of the Schönau refugee transit center originated with the Austrians and not with the terrorists; I very much hope that this report is ill-founded, for it raises too readily to the mind the specter of another era best confined to the past.

Yesterday, when I was necessarily absent, attending to needs of my constituents in upstate New York, the Senate adopted as an amendment to the foreign aid authorization, S. 2335, a provision expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should take determined steps to impress upon the Austrians the grave concern of the American people on its capitulation to the terrorist demands and calling upon the Austrians to reverse their reported decision and again to serve as a temporary refuge for the unfortunates fleeing the Soviet Union. I associate myself with this amendment, which was offered by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), and was